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Descriptive cataloging can be defined as “that phase of the process of cataloging which concerns itself with the identification and description of books.” It involves several levels of work. The first level is concerned with the choice of a main entry and of added entries and references by which to provide points of access for the library user. The second involves the construction of headings—fixing the place of the names or titles in the catalog. The third step involves the identification and description of the physical item—often by transcribing specified elements from the item itself—to aid the user in selecting or rejecting one item from the others in the file.

While it is important for a cataloger always to keep in mind the users of a particular catalog and the functions of that catalog in providing the descriptive cataloging data, the cataloger has found it increasingly necessary to do this within the larger context of being able to cooperate with other libraries—either to use all or some of the data from those libraries, or to contribute data for the use of other libraries. In order to cooperate most effectively, codes have become important tools for the descriptive cataloger. This paper will deal mainly with the development of general codes that have been available for catalogers in the United States. It will also discuss the generation of bibliographical data within local libraries.

THE TIME OF PIONEERING

In 1852, Charles C. Jewett recognized the need for standardization in his On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries. Proposing a national cooperative catalog using stereotype plates, he wrote: “Min-
Utle and stringent rules become absolutely indispensable, when the catalogue of each library is, as upon the proposed plan, to form part of a general catalogue. Uniformity is, then, imperative; but, among many laborers, can only be secured by the adherence of all to rules embracing, as far as possible, the minutest details of the work." Although his code would be used, Jewett was unable to bring his proposed catalog to fruition, nor did his attempts succeed in forming a national association of librarians to provide a forum for the discussion of cooperation and of codes for cataloging. However, in the American centennial year of 1876, 103 librarians visited Philadelphia to observe this historic occasion and to organize the American Library Association. As one of its early acts, the association established the Cooperative Committee and discussed the need for cooperative cataloging efforts, ranking the subject as third in importance of the permanent results of the conference.1

While the librarians were meeting, they received copies of the special report on Public Libraries in the United States of America4 on the second day of the three-day conference. Part II of the report was Charles A. Cutter's Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue, the first code for the dictionary catalog as a whole.

Cutter's code included "Objects" and "Means" for the catalog, definitions, and rules for entry. "Where to enter" included rules for the author, title, subject, and form aspects of cataloging as well as for analytics. The second section of the code was concerned with style ("how to enter"), Cutter advising: "Uniformity for its own sake is of very little account; for the sake of intelligibility, to prevent perplexity and misunderstanding, it is worth something."5 This section included rules for style of headings for the catalog and bibliographical description, concluding with rules for arrangement of entries. Appendices included a brief discussion of other types of catalogs and some reference works for the cataloger. Except for the three subsequent editions of Cutter, no other American code has been so inclusive.

Cutter's five-volume Boston Athenaeum Catalogue6 issued from 1874 to 1882 was well received by the profession, so his code of rules was also well received. A second edition appeared in 1889. Klas A. Linderfelt asserted that it was impossible to add to this edition in any helpful way.7 However, Cutter published a third edition in 1891, and a fourth edition was published in 1904, the year following his death. Each succeeding edition added rules and examples. The 205 rules on 80 pages for the first edition had grown to 369 rules on 146 pages in the fourth edition.
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For the Columbian Exposition of 1893, Melvil Dewey proposed a set of papers to form a handbook of library economy to show points of general agreement reached since 1876. William C. Lane, writing on cataloging, discussed some areas in which opinion was still divided. He noted that although several catalog codes were available, Cutter's rules were "most generally followed." Among fifty-eight libraries surveyed, Lane found that few libraries followed any one code absolutely, but most followed one or two as a general guide, changing details that seemed advisable for local needs. Cutter's rules were the most frequently used general guide. Also widely used was "Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog," issued in 1883 by the ALA Cooperative Committee. Intended only as an outline of cataloging, the condensed rules referred to Cutter's Rules for definitions, discussion of particular cases, and illustrative examples. In the second edition of his Rules, Cutter (as a member of the committee) included this skeletal outline of a code.

The ALA rules as applied and enlarged by Dewey's Library School were first printed in Library Notes in October 1886. Published separately in 1888 as Rules for Author and Classed Catalogs as used in Columbia College Library, later editions carried the title Library School Card Catalog Rules.

Klas Linderfelt, Librarian of the Milwaukee Public Library, adapted Karl Dziatzko's Instruction für die Ordnung der Titel im alphabetischen Zettelkatalog der Königlichen and Universität-bibliothek zu Breslau (Berlin, 1886). Linderfelt's Eclectic Card Catalog Rules, published by Cutter in 1890, covered author and title entries and references in the first part, while the second part contained information related to accents, transliteration, form and spelling of foreign names, and an exhaustive discussion of alphabetical arrangement.

In 1884, Fred B. Perkins issued San Francisco Cataloguing for Public Libraries. He tried to construct a manual which would enable anyone with a fair education and intelligence, who had never done any cataloging, to catalog an ordinary town library well enough for practical purposes. He believed that Cutter's Rules were remarkable but deficient in "rudimentary detail." To him, the ALA "Condensed Rules" were "too condensed to be of much service except to experienced cataloguers who will not need them."

Although the three leading codes in use—Cutter, Dewey and Linderfelt—did not differ substantially, in December 1900 the ALA Publishing Board appointed an Advisory Committee on Cataloging Rules, composed of J.C.M. Hanson, Salome Cutler Fairchild, Nina E.
Browne, Charles A. Cutter, T. Franklin Currier, Anderson H. Hopkins, and Alice B. Kroeger to reconcile their differences. The plan called for the committee to make its recommendations to the Publishing Board for submission to the ALA Council for approval. Catalogers would use meetings of their group, organized as a roundtable in 1900 and as a section in 1901, for discussion of difficult problems. This separate section provided a good forum for those most consistently interested in cataloging, but also led to the separation and isolation of catalogers from administrators. Before 1900, cataloging was a concern of all of ALA's members, since the issues were discussed in general meetings.

The Advisory Committee met in March 1901 in anticipation of the distribution of printed catalog cards by the Library of Congress. They made recommendations for typography and form of the cards, decided on the placement of collation (a disputed point for some time) and the placement of the series note. The ALA "Condensed Rules" as printed in Cutter were to be the point of orientation for discussion of fullness of name, pseudonyms, and corporate entries. The Advisory Committee could not, however, reach an agreement on designation for size, a problem which had plagued the association since its first meeting. Three alternatives were considered: (1) the bibliographical format to indicate approximate size (a holdover from earlier times when it had greater meaning), (2) letter symbols adopted by ALA in its early sessions; and (3) the exact size in centimeters.

The committee set the pattern for all future ALA codes by deciding that the plan for the code should be "carried out for the large library of scholarly character, since the small libraries would only gain by full entries, while the large libraries must lose if bibliographical fulness is not given." For this code, as well as the others which were to follow, the question would arise of whether an abridged edition should be issued. As it has turned out no abridged code for small libraries has ever been developed.

The Library of Congress began distributing cards in November 1901. To help librarians understand the practice on LC cards, the library issued an advance edition of the code in August 1902. An editorial in the Library Journal, as well as a review by Gardner M. Jones, hailed the rules as "progressive," and a "reaction against some of the minutiae of sign and symbol." The code was seen as an accepted standard for American libraries "if not for all time at least for the lifetime of most of those now engaged in library work." Alice
Kroeger, a member of the committee, assured librarians that there would not be "many decided changes in the future."22

Change, however, was inescapable. Although Hanson found the rules in the advance edition in "accord almost point for point with those of the Library of Congress,"23 the library issued additions to them. The first set of additional rules (for collation and series notes) was dated April 20, 1903.24 The printed rules were issued on cards and in pamphlet form with a copy of each card sent free of charge to subscribers to LC cards. Nonsubscriber libraries could order them in the same manner and for the same price as LC cards. The rules in pamphlet form were free to all.

In 1904, a request came from the Catalogue Rules Committee of the (British) Library Association to join with the ALA committee to consider the adoption of a joint code of rules for American and British libraries. The draft code submitted by the British was based, in part, on the ALA advance edition of 1902 and the points of differences were found to be fewer than had been anticipated. Various exchanges by correspondence took place from 1905 to 1907, delaying the publication of the American edition several years. In September 1907, Hanson traveled to Glasgow to meet with the British and the two committees came to full agreement on all but 8 of 174 rules.25 The American rules, printed in 1908, included some LC supplementary rules and also identified the areas of difference between the British and American codes.26

The publication of this 1908 code set several trends. Important was the trend toward cooperation, not only among librarians in this country, but also with librarians abroad. Hanson's trip across the Atlantic would be repeated many times by catalogers from both sides of the ocean. Second, the role of leadership assumed by the Library of Congress in code revision continued. The Library of Congress provided Hanson to edit the 1908 code. In subsequent years, Charles Martel, Nella Martin, Clara Beetle, Lucile Morsch, Seymour Lubetzky, C. Sumner Spalding and Paul Winkler would also come from the Library of Congress. Third, the code confirmed the emphasis on author and title entries, leaving subject entry "theory" to Cutter's rules.

The pioneering years were also times of "settling in," but some unsettling affairs in the offing would once again affect codes. Charles Hastings once hinted that American libraries had become quite spoiled by LC's printed cards. Once LC had begun to issue some cards,
the libraries expected it to fill all their cataloging needs. With the availability of printed cards for ever-increasing amounts of materials and with more places to locate LC card order numbers, more and more libraries of all types took advantage of the service. The growth in the files of cards at LC resulted in space problems as well as in printing delays. World War I brought added problems: new books were not received on time and assistants went to war or to the ALA War Service. Changes in personnel were frequent after the war when low salaries at LC made it difficult to keep efficient workers. Then, during the depression, large libraries found it difficult to get funds to buy cards. In 1931/32, for the first time since card distribution had begun, the sale of cards decreased from the previous year.

On the whole, the attitude of many administrators and librarians toward cataloging left much to be desired. With the printing of LC cards, too many librarians had taken seriously Cutter's statement about "the golden age of cataloging" being over, even though for some libraries only a small percentage of cataloging was provided by LC. As the profession concerned itself with principles of "efficiency management," it looked critically at cataloging production. In a paper read at the New York Regional Catalog Group, T. Franklin Currier, Assistant Librarian at Harvard, noted that in the year ending June 30, 1928, Harvard was able to procure LC cards for only 15 percent of the titles cataloged. With a grant from the General Education Board, the ALA Committee on Cooperative Cataloging began a study in 1931 that eventually resulted in more detailed plans for providing copy. In 1940, LC agreed to take this entire operation under its sole auspices; nevertheless, the efforts failed to increase the flow of cooperative copy to the degree hoped.

The Library of Congress continued to issue supplementary cataloging rules which were sent to other libraries. In addition, a new series of rules relating to points peculiar to cataloging in the Library of Congress, or points in which that library's practice was still in the experimental state, were distributed only to catalogers at LC or to those libraries supplying copy to be printed at LC. To illustrate some of its cataloging practice, LC issued guides for the cataloging of periodicals, serial publications of societies and institutions, and government publications.

The emphasis on cooperative cataloging in the 1930s promoted the idea of a new code. Rudolph H. Gjelsness, writing to Carl H. Milam on projects that might have a bearing on the scholarly and bibliographical work of ALA, recommended: "revision of the A.L.A. Cata-
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log Rules. . . . This is now out of date and in many respects inadequate for present needs. New rulings should be made, and the old ones scrutinized with particular attention to further extension of cooperative cataloging." Meanwhile, Hastings, chief of LC's Card Division, wrote about the first year of the Cooperative Cataloging Committee's work, and noted the difficulty resulting from the fact that both the ALA catalog rules and LC's supplementary rules were general codes that failed to cover a multitude of small points except by interpretation. The widespread concern of librarians generally was reflected by New York catalogers in 1932 in the "Summary of Discussion of need for Revision of Catalog Code."

Later in 1932, the ALA Executive Board created a Committee on Revision of the ALA Catalog Code, defining the duties of the committee to make necessary revision in the ALA catalog rules while cooperating with the Library Association and other national library associations if this seemed advisable. Charles Martel from the Library of Congress was named to head the committee, working with an executive committee composed of William W. Bishop, J.C.M. Hanson, Margaret Mann, Harriet D. MacPherson and R.H. Gjelsness.

In a November 11, 1932, memorandum to the committee, Martel called for their suggestions and for a thorough study of inquiries from catalogers and the public and for a comparison with foreign codes. "The conclusion seems justified," he wrote, "that but few of the important rules—the rules that govern the principal main entry headings—call for serious changes." He saw an exception to this in the "now more and more prevalent publications of mixed authorship—personal, corporate and official—in various degrees of complexity." As suggestions came to Martel from individuals and groups, he reflected that catalogers seemed to want a handbook more than a "mere skeleton of rules with a few examples illustrating." He changed his mind about the amount of revision necessary, estimating that nearly all the rules required extensive addition. The next year's conference found Martel reporting that "the rules are being made as explicit a guide to cataloging as minute specifications fully illustrated by examples can make."

While acknowledging Martel's contributions, many librarians objected to delays in revision. They called for someone of more administrative or executive ability to push the code toward completion, citing the Committee on Cooperative Cataloging in particular as requiring the code in their work. The two years which were earlier projected for code revision doubled, and the Carnegie Corporation
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granted ALA $15,000 payable over two years to expedite the work. Various advisory subcommittees were appointed, and on September 15, 1936, Nella Martin began her work as executive assistant to the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee with Martel continuing as a consultant.43

Up to this time, the British had not participated in this revision. In August 1936, however, an inquiry came from them about code revision progress.44 In October of the same year, James D. Stewart, chairperson of the British code revision committee, met with Gjelsness, chairperson of the American committee. Assured of a desire to cooperate, the American committee agreed to assemble the materials and reach tentative conclusions before submitting anything to the British.45 By June 1938, the American committee questioned whether the preliminary edition could be a joint one. Preoccupied with rushing things to completion, the committee became concerned over the length of time the British were taking to deliberate, remaining convinced, however, that the two groups should work together toward a final joint edition.46 The outbreak of World War II in 1939 delayed action further, and a joint code did not materialize.

In 1939, Gjelsness announced that working drafts of the code had been issued in a small edition and distributed primarily to committee members.47 It was September 1941 before 300 copies of the preliminary edition were distributed for study and criticism to a larger group, and 700 copies were made available for purchase.48 Even before it was available for sale, however, some librarians objected that certain aspects of the new code were too elaborate and would never be used by the public.

"AN ERA OF CRITICISM OF CATALOGING": THE GREEN AND THE RED BOOKS

In June 1941, Andrew Osborn read The Crisis in Cataloging to the American Library Institute.49 This, according to Paul Dunkin, opened up an era of criticism of cataloging. "The paper's title was dramatic, the style was popular, and in its sweeping generalizations the simmering frustrations of a generation of librarians came to boil. . . . Everybody read it, every cataloger talked or wrote about it and it gave a name and an atmosphere to a whole era of thinking about cataloging."50

Although he did not discuss the 1941 preliminary code, Osborn wrote about the philosophy of codes and the relationship of this
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philosophy to the cataloging situation, and he called for more cooperation between administrators and catalogers. Osborn perceived four theories of cataloging in vogue. The most dominant was the legalistic theory, calling for rules and definitions to cover every point that arises and to provide an authority to settle questions at issue. The second was the theory of perfectionism, which called for the cataloger to catalog a book so well, in all respects, that the job would be done once and for all (an impossibility, of course). Third was the theory of bibliographic cataloging, attempting to make cataloging into a branch of descriptive bibliography. Finally, the pragmatic theory asserted that rules hold and decisions are made only to the extent that they seem practical. Since needs are so different, standardized cataloging for all types of libraries was pragmatically impossible. Therefore, a few simple rules for catalogers trained to use judgment would suffice. This was in sharp contrast to Martel’s position.

The ALA code which appeared a short while later most nearly represented Osborn’s legalistic theory. Its 408 pages of rules lacked guiding principles or theory. Part I pertained to “Entry and Heading,” while Part II dealt with “Description of the Book.” The appendices covered: abbreviations; punctuation, modified vowels, accents and figures; capitalization; transliteration; authority card; incunabula; maps and atlases; and music.

The code met with a divergent reception. On December 31, 1941, the ALA Council approved the establishment of the Committee on the Use of the ALA Catalog Code “to consider the revised A.L.A. Catalog Rules from the standpoint of the library administrator as well as the cataloger, particularly with regard to the question of elaboration and of expense.” After two years of careful study, this committee recommended that a Committee on Catalog Code Revision be authorized to proceed with the editorial revision of Part I in light of all criticism then before it, and to reconsider the question of rules for descriptive cataloging considering whatever decisions have been reached by LC and ALA.

By the ALA annual meeting in 1946, Amelia Krieg, president of the Division of Cataloging and Classification (DCC) reported that an editor would be appointed for Part I to work with an advisory board. Clara Beetle was granted a leave of absence from her position in LC’s Descriptive Cataloging Division to serve as the editor and began preparation of the revised edition in September 1946. By the annual meeting of DCC in July 1947, she reported that the text of
Part I had been edited. Because of publishing problems, the code did not appear until 1949. This was the Red Book.

Meanwhile, criticisms of Part II of the 1941 code abounded. The work was filled with detail that few libraries would need. Even prior to its publication, there had been signs that some of the major libraries in the country had abandoned LC's elaborate description and "developed more effective rules for their own purposes." Those who participated in cooperative cataloging found themselves working with two different codes and there were even signs that perhaps LC would soon adopt a briefer form of descriptive cataloging.

Even before Archibald MacLeish, the newly appointed Librarian of Congress, took office in October 1939, he was urged by librarians to do something about the delay of LC cards to subscribers. In response, he set up various committees of experts inside and outside of LC to make studies and reports, and did some study of his own. As part of the study on LC card delays, he wrote to Arnold H. Trotier, on November 15, 1939, suggesting that the committee investigating this problem "ascertain what, if any, bibliographical data (possibly added by changes of procedure over a period of years), may now be omitted from our printed catalog cards without affecting the integrity of the system of printed catalogue cards serving not only ourselves but also upwards of 7,000 libraries." Trotier, Margaret Mann, Harriet MacPherson, Keyes Metcalf, Rudolph Gjelsness and Wyllis Wright were called to Washington to study LC's problems. One of their discoveries was an arrearage of 1,670,161 unprocessed volumes, with 30,000 books being added to that number annually.

Carleton B. Joeckel, Paul N. Rice and Andrew Osborn made up yet another LC advisory committee, the Librarian's Committee. Although the report of this committee remained confidential, Joeckel requested Andrew Osborn to write the Crisis in Cataloging "to present some of the evidence uncovered." As a result of the Librarian's Committee report, LC's subject cataloging was separated from the other cataloging operations and the phrase "descriptive cataloging" was coined "to cover the choice and form of main and added entries, transcription of title-page details, collation, etc. The Committee wanted to get away from the prevalent term 'bibliographical cataloging' which had overtones it wanted to avoid both for the Library of Congress and for libraries in general." Not least important for future events was the committee's conclusion that "there must be recognition of the need for modifications in the form and fulness of cataloging." Meanwhile, the Librarian of Congress acknowledged that "one of the present necessities in
the cataloging operations of the Library is the progressive development of rules of practice for cataloging."

Discussion and studies of rules for descriptive cataloging began early in 1942 at LC. Seymour Lubetzky—technical assistant to the Director of the Processing Department—prepared in 1943 an "Analysis of Current Descriptive Cataloging Practice." In previous rules for descriptive cataloging, Lubetzky found a lack of a statement of function, resulting in cataloging entries repetitious in some aspects but inadequate in others. There was no underlying interrelationship in the organization of the elements, although there was an effort to preserve the integrity of the title page. Lubetzky saw the latter as no longer justified in modern books.

During the later years of World War II, ALA annual meetings were canceled, so from October 18 to November 19, 1943, Herman Henkle (director of LC's Processing Department) and Lucile Morsch (chief of LC's Descriptive Cataloging Section) conducted a series of conferences in fifteen cities to ascertain from catalogers and administrators whether there was a basic difference between LC's needs in descriptive cataloging and those of other libraries. It became more and more apparent that a statement of function of the catalog, and guiding principles upon which to base the rules, both lacking in previous codes, were necessary. A set of principles was presented to librarians at two meetings in November and December 1945. Questionnaires regarding the proposals were distributed to twenty-eight additional catalogers and administrators, evoking "expressions of feeling ranging from apprehension to enthusiasm and relief." On the whole, the returns seemed to indicate that the proposed principles and changes were adequate for the majority of users of catalogs.

The Librarian of Congress appointed an Advisory Committee on Descriptive Cataloging, which agreed in general with the proposals but made further suggestions and modifications. Lucile Morsch then drafted Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress (RDC), which appeared in June 1947. Reports of ALA subcommittees led to some revisions, and in January 1949 ALA accepted the revised draft to supersede Part II of the 1941 ALA Catalog Rules. Publication of this draft of RDC appeared in September 1949 after the addition of chapters on maps, music and incunabula. This was the Green Book.

After RDC was published, work began on rules for other nonbook materials based upon the objectives of descriptive cataloging. These objectives had evolved to be: "(1) to state the significant features of an
item with the purpose of distinguishing it from other items and describing its scope, contents and bibliographic relation to other items; (2) to present these data in an entry which can be integrated with the entries for other items in the catalog and which will respond best to the interests of most users of the catalog. In following these, RDC intended to describe each item as fully as necessary but with an economy of data and expression. The terms used by the author, publisher, or other authority in issuing the item were the usual basis of the description. The basic part of the description was set forth in the body of the entry (i.e., the first paragraph after the heading) in a prescribed order: title, subtitle, author statement, edition statement (including statement of translator, illustrator or illustrations), and imprint. The second paragraph included the collation and series note, and supplementary notes were included in as many succeeding paragraphs as required. The data came mostly from the title page but would no longer require transcription of the elements in title page order. Omissions from the title page would require ellipses only if they came from the title, the alternative title or subtitle. Rules for capitalization, abbreviations and recording numerals were included in the appendices. In addition to rules for separately published monographs, there were to be found those for issues, offprints, supplements, indexes, analytical entries, serials, maps, relief models, globes and atlases, music, facsimiles, photocopies, microfilms, and incunabula. From 1952 to 1959, separate publications were issued covering the rules for descriptive cataloging of phonorecords; motion pictures and filmstrips; books in raised characters; manuscripts; and pictures, designs and other two-dimensional representations.

In the Red Book the rules for entry and headings, as they were published in 1949, were developed for the dictionary catalog’s author and title entries. The main entry was based upon authorship (i.e., the person or corporate body “considered to be chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the work”). This was to extend the finding list function of the catalog “beyond what is required for location of a single book to the location of literary units about which the seeker has less precise information.” Added entries were to help to achieve this kind of location for users who lacked complete knowledge about a work to complete the assembling of related materials as part of a literary unit. The added entry would, of course, often fail to accomplish this since added entries relate to a representation of a work (i.e., a book) rather than to the work itself. The lack of provision for naming a uniform title made it impossible in many instances for this
code to achieve what it had intended; however, uniform entries were established for names based upon the full and real names of persons, and the full name of corporate bodies; for both, the use of the vernacular was the first choice.

Structurally, this edition attempted to arrange the material so as to emphasize the basic rules and subordinate their amplifications. Purporting to make a more logical sequence and to reduce the number of alternative rules, the editor still did not achieve a logically structured code that flowed evenly from one point to another. Rules for choice of entry and construction of heading, particularly in regard to pseudonyms and corporate headings, were confusingly intermixed. Exceptions followed exceptions. With no clear underlying principles, the case-by-case method was all that could be effected. Lacking a definite rule for a given situation, the cataloger could only resort to cataloging by analogy.

Many criticized the code. Osborn claimed that while great publicity was being afforded the new LC rules, the ALA code was pushed through on a "hush-hush" basis. Haste had killed the ALA code, and after a close study of it, he believed many librarians would feel that the third edition could not come too soon. He indicated that the code was already outmoded since it did not follow changes which LC was already using, such as "no conflict" cataloging.

A Library of Congress Processing Department Memorandum (No. 60, April 20, 1949) announced the library's plan to speed up the work of cataloging by establishing personal names in the form given in the book being cataloged without further search, provided that the name in the work conformed to the ALA Cataloging Rules for entry and was not so similar to another name already established as to give basis for the suspicion that both names refer to the same person. Some attempt would be made to supply the first given name if it was respresented on the book being cataloged by only an initial or an abbreviation. This practice was based on an LC study made in February 1948. In approximately 90 percent of the cases, LC found that the form of name on the book could be used without conflict with previously established names.

In its 1948/49 report, DCC recommended that a serious study be made of LC's "no conflict" cataloging in an attempt to gain simplification in the form of the heading. Pressure to change the ALA Cataloging Rules began even before they were off the press!

This era is a confusing one. Even as rules were being developed, practice was being implemented that would, in some cases at least, be
contrary to them. There was a failure to define what the catalog should do before rules were constructed to make the catalog. During this decade, the Library of Congress increased its role in the study of cataloging, in code revision, and in determination of practice. LC became so active that ALA members began to wonder about their own role in the determination of cataloging rules. It was agreed that the Library of Congress would make no major change in its rules for descriptive cataloging without consulting ALA’s DCC. Such joint approval regarding cataloging codes has continued to the present.

“A COMPLETE RECONSTRUCTION OF OUR CODE IN ACCORDANCE WITH DELIBERATELY ADOPTED OBJECTIVES”

In May 1951, DCC’s newly established Board on Cataloging Policy and Research decided that the most important problem to study was that of corporate entry. LC and Seymour Lubetzky were again called upon to explore a cataloging problem. Lubetzky studied the background and philosophy of the rules and practice of cataloging materials of corporate bodies. Before the 1953 ALA Conference, every member in good standing of DCC was sent a copy of Lubetzky’s *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, subtitled “A Critique of the A.L.A. Rules for Entry and a Proposed Design for Their Revision.” He found many of the ALA rules to be either unnecessary or not properly related to the code. Some rules were inconsistent with others or different from others for reasons irrelevant to the purposes of cataloging. The multiplicity of rules was designed to fit particular cases which occasioned them, rather than to meet certain bibliographical conditions. Particularly confusing were rules for societies and institutions. He concluded that “a rationalization of our cataloging will require not a revision of any particular rules, but a complete reconstruction of our code in accordance with deliberately adopted objectives which should define the aim of our rules, and well considered principles which would outline the pattern and character of the code.”

Lubetzky saw the objectives of such a code as enabling the catalog user to determine whether the library has the book as well as revealing the works that the library has by a given author and what editions or translations of a given work are in the library. Since author and title entries are the most common elements used in citing and searching for publications, the principles and rules for entries should
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be based on these elements. To Lubetzky, these principles concerned themselves "with the elemental bibliographic conditions of a book and thus provide the core around which a logical and practical pattern for a cataloging code could be evolved."xv

The theme of DCC's 1953 conference sessions was "ALA Rules of Entry: The Proposed Revolution"; papers relating to Lubetzky's report were presented.xvi Later Lubetzky's report was discussed at meetings of the division's regional groups and by representative bodies in England, France, Switzerland, Cuba, and Japan. (Throughout the preparation of the study, Lubetzky had kept in correspondence with Henry Sharp of the Library Association.)

In view of the recommendations of the Lubetzky report and the interest expressed in it, the DCC Executive Board appointed a committee to investigate the desirability of a revision of the code.xvii In 1954, a Catalog Code Revision Committee Steering Committee composed of Wyllis Wright, Laura Colvin, Pauline Seely, Evelyn Hensel, and Richard Angell was appointed. Later, other members would be added to the committee or to subcommittees.xviii

Code revision was to be planned around four propositions advanced by the steering committee: (1) the library catalog is primarily a finding list of items in the library's collection, and only secondarily a reference tool; (2) economy in the construction of a catalog should be emphasized up to the point where loss in economy in meeting a valid reference need resulted; (3) code revision should proceed without regard to consideration of recataloging of materials in existing catalogs; and (4) the proposed code was to be for author and title entries to serve in constructing a catalog of all types of library materials.xix

By 1956, the framework of revision began to take shape and an agreement between ALA and LC was made in regard to preparation of the new code. RDC was to be incorporated into the new edition, and at ALA's request, LC made available the services of Seymour Lubetzky to work with the Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) and to prepare a draft code.

As Lubetzky prepared several draft codesxx and as important working papersxix were prepared for two conferences relating to the code, one would have to look hard to find another time in American cataloging history when so much thorough investigation was being carried out in regard to code revision. At the 1960 conference in Montreal, the attendance of a number of international representatives heralded the dawn of more intensive international cooperation, the implications of which are yet to be determined fully.

July, 1976
Nine American librarians in London during the summer of 1952 were invited by the Library Association to discuss code revision with the British Cataloguing Rules Sub-Committee. The British, not having recognized the 1949 code, were working on a revision of the 1908 code and were considering the possibility of a code with from twelve to twenty basic rules, each of which would be followed by specialized applications. Having already established contact with Lubetzky, the subcommittee urged that consideration be given once again to an Anglo-American code.\(^3\) Even wider cooperative efforts were soon to occur in catalog reform. Until this time “the leaders of this movement were primarily American and were working essentially within the American tradition” and “the slow and painful efforts to incorporate the new insights into a working code have also been overwhelmingly American”;\(^4\) now, however, the trend would be toward international considerations through the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA).

In 1954, the Working Group on the Co-ordination of Cataloging Principles was appointed by IFLA’s General Council. By 1957, the General Council proposed a worldwide conference to seek agreement on basic cataloging principles. With a grant from the Council on Library Resources (CLR), a preliminary meeting was held in London from July 19-25, 1959. Among the fifteen working papers prepared was one on the “Principles for the Construction of a Cataloging Code” by Wyllis Wright and Seymour Lubetzky. As a result of the discussions at this conference, there was unanimous agreement that “a basis exists for a broad agreement on important cataloging principles.” Confidence was expressed that an international conference “could achieve practical results which would facilitate access to an international exchange of bibliographical information.”\(^5\)

The Institute on Catalog Code Revision held at McGill University, Montreal, June 13-17, 1960 (sponsored by the ALA Cataloging and Classification Section, the Canadian Library Association’s Cataloging Section, and McGill University), included among its 255 registrants persons from England, France, Germany, India, Mexico, Russia, and the Philippines, as well as from Canada and the United States. Among this group were the members of the organizing committee for the proposed IFLA Conference, so a further chance was given for an
understanding of the work of the Americans. Serving as resources for the institute were Lubetzky's working drafts and papers alluded to above.

The CLR provided the funds for the International Conference on Cataloging Principles (ICCP) held in Paris, October 9-18, 1961, which attracted representatives from fifty-three countries and twelve international organizations. While the principles and decisions of this conference were not vastly different from those generally accepted, the international acceptance of them was “a landmark, a watershed in the history of cataloging.” Chief among the achievements was the acceptance of corporate authorship—a long-disputed point among the German and Scandinavian traditions.

The conference dealt only with the choice and form of headings and entry words in catalogs of printed books (defined to include other materials having similar characteristics) in author/title catalogs. The “Statement of Principles” was framed for catalogs of large general libraries, but with modifications could be recommended for other libraries and to other alphabetical lists of books. The function of the catalog was stated; its structure was defined; the kinds of entries, and the functions, choice and form of different kinds of entries were noted.

It is appropriate to recount here some developments that belong chronologically in the next section, but which illuminate the nature of the Paris agreements and their implications for cataloging in the United States. With international agreement on the basic general principles, related to the first aspects of descriptive cataloging, the next consideration would be to set some international standards for description of the physical item. In 1963, Mary Piggott, a member of the Library Association’s Cataloguing Rules Committee and a participant in the 1961 IFLA Conference, suggested that it was reasonable to hope that agreement could follow on the choice, form and sequence of the items of description necessary to complete the author/title entries. To this end, she identified the essential areas of description of the physical item.

In 1969, IFLA sponsored the International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts held in Copenhagen to consider the effect of the “Statement of Principles” as well as other possible areas of international cooperation. By that time, U.S. librarians, through the Shared Cataloging program in effect since early 1966, had discovered that they could accept the descriptive cataloging for physical items supplied by the national bibliographies of a number of countries throughout the
world. In addition, the growing use of electronic data processing in bibliographical systems made desirable the establishment of an international standard for the descriptive content of cataloging entries. MARC had been designed as a standard format for the interchange of bibliographic records on magnetic tape, but it did not define the content of individual records.\textsuperscript{102}

By October 1971, the Working Group on the International Standard Bibliographic Description, again founded by CLR, had prepared the preliminary edition of the \textit{International Standard Bibliographic Description (for single volume and multi-volume monographic publications)}.\textsuperscript{105} ISBD(M), as it came to be known, was designed "as an instrument for the international communication of bibliographical information."\textsuperscript{104} The elements of bibliographical description to be used in all bibliographical activities to identify a record were specified, as well as the order in which they were to be presented and the punctuation to be used. The objectives were "to make records from different sources interchangeable; to facilitate their interpretation across language barriers; and to facilitate the conversion of such records to machine-readable form."\textsuperscript{103} The first standard edition was published in 1974; in July of that year, the North American text of Chapter 6 of the \textit{Anglo-American Cataloging Rules} was revised in accord with ISBD(M).\textsuperscript{106} Since the international standard had essentially accepted the order of the elements as included in American descriptive cataloging codes since 1947, the changes in the new Chapter 6 came in the new punctuation, in the imprint area, and in the use of data not on the title page without the use of brackets if the data were obtained from certain specified sources.

According to John D. Byrum, Jr., a meeting was held in October 1975 "between representatives of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR and the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing which had the result of producing an agreement specifying a framework to govern the contents and future developments of specific ISBDs."\textsuperscript{107} Catalogers who once had given up the niceties of spacing, punctuation, etc., as rather unimportant descriptive cataloging elements must bring them back again as absolute essentials.

**BACK FROM PARIS—COMPROMISE AND THE PARIS PRINCIPLES**

Much credit for the success at Paris in 1961 belongs to U.S. librarians, but their brilliant efforts were soon to be curtailed at home.
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In fact, some erosion had already begun before the conference. On August 9, 1960, Lubetzky resigned from the staff of LC. For almost twenty years, his voice had urged Americans to concentrate on principles and "the fundamentals of cataloging." When Lubetzky resigned from LC, the library canceled the ALA-LC contract supporting editorial work of the committee. No rules for special materials had yet been drafted—there was important work yet to be done. Cooperation, economy and compromise, which seem to go hand in hand with American code revision, came back together. The production of a code that would not consider costs could not come to pass. Throughout code revision discussions in 1961 were "considerations of methods by which proposed new rules might be implemented and whether it would be necessary to change headings already established or whether the new rules might be applied to newly established headings only. Mr. Spalding suggested the term 'superimposition' for the latter method." In December 1961, Johannes L. Dewton, then assistant chief of LC's Union Catalog Division, suggested that CCRC suspend its work and instead revise the 1949 rules in light of the Paris Principles. In response, CCRC affirmed "its intention to carry the draft code to completion on the Paris Principles as modified by committee action." There were tough decisions ahead for the committee, who wanted to follow the urging of ICCP to implement the principles in their own codes, even while there was pressure from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and from LC to compromise on certain principles. Particularly difficult was the principle for entering the institutions under their own names—the basis on which some countries had agreed to accept the Paris Principles. While the British (who were working closely with CCRC) saw the difficulties for existing catalogs, they also realized the importance to libraries of other countries for the United States to accept the principle, if not the practice. Because LC adopted superimposition, the need to write the rules in a manner contradictory to the Paris Principles was gone. At the meeting where entering institutions under their own name or under place was being discussed, Lucile Morsch, representing the Library of Congress, announced that LC had already decided to introduce the superimposing of one pattern of cataloging upon another pattern that had previously been followed. In June 1962, the Library of Congress agreed to give C. Sumner Spalding a leave of absence as chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division to be the editor of the new code, while Morsch would edit...
the chapters on description of the physical items. The code would be entitled the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) but would be published in two editions, American and British, with the ALA and LA reserving the right to publish any variants considered necessary. Quite obviously, the British would not adopt the "institutions" compromise forced by LC and ARL. Financial support to complete the code came from CLR (which contributed a total of $82,399 for the code), LC and ALA. In the spring of 1967, the long-awaited code appeared.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES

Because reviews, criticisms and summaries of AACR appeared in many sources, coverage here will be brief.

First, this code is based on principles which in turn are based on a statement about the function of the catalog. The function of the catalog has not been the most popular subject in cataloging literature or in code revision sessions, yet Ruth Strout Carnovsky tells us that we could help solve code problems if "we could reach some decisions about the purposes of catalogs."

Cutter identified inquiries with which the user is likely to approach the catalog. These could be regarded as statements of functions of the catalog. Cutter's codes identified what he called "Objects and Means of a Catalog." In the second edition of his rules Cutter noted that "this statement of Objects and Means has been criticized; but as it has also been frequently quoted, usually without change or credit, in the prefaces of catalogues and elsewhere, I suppose it has on the whole been approved." One must agree. His code was, after all, an attempt "to investigate what might be called the first principles of cataloging," but Lubetzky observed that Cutter never formulated "general governing principles to be detailed in the rules." Cutter's explanations under specific rules seem to come about as close as anything to the governing principles. No American code openly stated objectives or functions again until the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in 1947.

For Lubetzky it was natural to turn to objectives when he was writing the draft codes that preceded AACR. To develop a "rational and functional system of cataloging" rather than a maze of rules, Lubetzky set about to identify the material cataloged as a medium through which the work (i.e., the intellectual content) is presented. The work might be presented through different media and many
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deditions. He saw the material (the book) and the work, which are not the same things, as being blurred in previous codes. In his study of the fundamentals of cataloging, Lubetzky identified these objectives of cataloging in his *Code of Cataloging Rules*:

First, to facilitate the location of a particular publication, i.e. of a particular edition of a work, which is in the library.

Second, to relate and display together the editions which a library has of a given work and the works which it has of a given author.\(^{121}\)

These statements were influential in forming the “Functions of the Catalogue” statement in the Paris Principles:

The catalogue should be an efficient instrument for ascertaining 2.1 whether the library contains a particular book specified by

(a) its author and title, or

(b) if the author is not named in the book, its title alone, or

(c) if the author and title are inappropriate or insufficient for identification, a suitable substitute for the title; and

2.2 (a) which works by a particular author and

(b) which editions of a particular work are in the library.\(^{122}\)

While AACR does not completely fulfill these functions (which, incidentally, are not included in the AACR text), it does so better than other codes have done.

To discharge the functions, a certain structure is assumed for the catalog. In the IFLA statement it is assumed that the catalog will contain at least one entry for each book cataloged and more when this is necessary in the interest of the user or because of the characteristics of the book. The Paris Principles assume the use of main and added entries and references, the traditional structures upon which the author/title catalog has been built. To Cutter, who was first thinking of a book catalog, and to others even today, the idea of a main entry meant a full entry; or, as Lubetzky stated, the “most important entry for a given work.”\(^{123}\) The other entries were considered auxiliary entries. Cutter did not include a definition of main entry until his fourth edition. By then, printed cards were available and, if unit cards were used, the entries were all the same except that the main entry served as a record of the other entries, including references made for the catalog. From the time of Cutter, the main entry was usually first thought of as an author entry. In applying AACR, many more entries become title entries than under previous codes.

[247]
A main entry is assumed to be necessary in AACR to serve as a collocating device—"the necessity persists because, for one thing, even in multiple-entry catalogs it sometimes happens that a work, other than the work being cataloged, must be identified by a single entry—e.g., a work about which the work in hand has been written or a work on which the work in hand has been based." While an added entry can locate a *book*, only the main entry can with certainty bring together the representations of the *work*, the works related to the work, and the criticisms of it. Those who equate the unit card practice with the main entry concept fail to take this into account.

In AACR, the choice of main entry is approached as a problem of analyzing authorship responsibility. If no principal author can be identified (except for works of two or three), entry goes to title by default. The code is not always clear-cut or logical in this analysis, but it does call for an identification of the bibliographical conditions in the book itself.

The construction of heading depends on the analysis of problems and subproblems related to names. The first problem to be solved is the choice of a name and a particular form of that name. The second problem involves the conformation in which the name should appear in the catalog. In keeping with the Paris Principles, the code attempts to allow the name to be that which was used by the author in his or her works; when a choice is necessary, however, AACR prefers reference sources to the way the author is most frequently identified in his or her works, as IFLA suggests.

One of the departures of AACR from the Paris Principles concerned the entry of collections. The Paris Principles prefer entry of a collection consisting of independent works (or parts of works of different authors) under the title of the collection if a collective title is present, unless the name of the compiler appears prominently on the title page; this was largely a concession to the Anglo-American point of view. At ICCP, a proposal to permit entry under compiler if named on the title page lost; the proposal to permit entry under compiler if prominently named won. The rules in AACR as published made a distinction between editors of works of shared authorship (i.e., written for the same occasion and publication) and compilers of collections (defined as previously published individual works). The rules for compilers allowed entry under compiler if the compiler was named on the title page (rule 5). The rules for editors took into consideration the different types of editorial activity allowing entry under an editor if all three of the following conditions were met:
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editor named on the title page; if the publisher’s name was not part of the title; and if the editor was primarily responsible for the existence of the work (rule 4). The first two conditions were easily determined. The third one was difficult to determine if the work itself gave no positive clues. A modest editor could become merely an added entry rather than a main entry simply because he or she did not openly indicate the degree of responsibility assumed. Despite a note in Cataloging Service to help the cataloger in this decision-making process, the decisions were difficult and arbitrary. One especially difficult aspect of this rule concerned works of a continuing nature where changes in editors or compilers often occur. These works could become widely separated in the catalog if entry were under editor or compiler.

Codes before AACR tended to follow the Anglo-American tradition with entry under the editor or compiler as the first choice. Several previous codes were better than AACR, allowing for entry under editor or compiler as the first choice but giving options for title or other entry under certain conditions. For example, Cutter (1904, rules 100-104) cited cases in which “for convenience of the public it is better that the catalog’s recognition of the collector should in certain cases take the form of reference or added entry rather than of main entry.” Such cases included anonymous collections, periodicals, “collections intended to be indefinitely continued,” and “collections known chiefly by their titles.” Festschriften “may be entered” under the name of the person being honored. ALA 1904, 1908, 1941 and 1949 allowed for entry under title for conditions indicating that the editor’s contributions were slight or where there were frequent changes of editors.

In keeping with the current policy of revision between editions, Cataloging Service records an official change that calls for entry of such works with a collective title under the title. A long-standing American tradition has come to an end. Little attention seems to have been paid to two user studies which indicate that an “author” (and AACR did consider editors and compilers as authors) approach is the preferred choice of users when both author and title are known, even when information about a title is better known than that about the author. Significantly, fewer than one-half of the users who fail in a first attempt to locate a known item continue their search.

Since it is based upon identification of bibliographical conditions, AACR attempts to do away with special rules for special types of materials rather than using the case-method approach of the earlier
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rules. Each rule dealing with a special problem is to be understood in the context of the more general rules. Rules for entry, heading and description in the general section for monographs apply to the cataloging of nonbook materials as well. For such instances where the general rules are inappropriate or insufficient, special rules are provided.

Serials received a special rule for entry in AACR. While AACR makes provisions for entry of serials under personal or corporate author or under title, some librarians, taking account of the computer age and the desirability of international standardization, are calling for entry of all serials under title. The advantages and disadvantages of title entry have recently been discussed by several persons. While arbitrary title main entry for serials is not a new idea (it having at one time been the choice of the CCRC for AACR), the consequences of such a decision may cause problems for users because in the past, not even title added entries were provided for serials with "nondistinctive" titles.

Several changes relating to headings for corporate bodies appear in AACR. Those bodies treated subordinately can be entered as a subheading of the lowest element in the hierarchy that can be independently entered. Intervening elements can be omitted if they are not necessary to clarify the function of the smaller body as an element of the larger one. It now appears that this rule may not survive current code revision.

Included in the North American text of AACR as published were rules 98 and 99, providing for entry of institutions under place. By May 1972, these rules were deleted from AACR, allowing institutions to be entered as other corporate bodies and bringing AACR a little closer to the Paris Principles.

"IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT THE AACR IS THE LAST CODE WE SHALL SEE"

On March 24, 1974, the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) was formed. This international committee is made up of one representative each from the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, Catalog Code Revision Committee; the British Library; the National Library of Canada; the Library of Congress; and the Library Association. In addition to the JSC, code revision committees are at work in each of the countries, with the British con-
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Why, less than a decade after fifteen years of the most expensive code revision ever experienced, are persons again engaged in this activity? There are several reasons. C. Donald Cook indicated soon after AACR was published that general consensus on a code had not been reached, citing particularly the Standard for Descriptive Cataloging of Government Scientific and Technical Reports as one instance of variance from AACR. This work, first issued in 1963 by the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information of the Federal Council for Sciences and Technology, aimed at achieving uniform cataloging of technical reports by government agencies. Designed particularly for relatively untrained catalogers, the work preferred main entry primarily under corporate author at a time when AACR was providing for more entries under persons. A second problem indicated by Cook was the concern on the part of those working in computer applications about the suitability of the new code for computer-based cataloging purposes. “It is doubtful,” predicted Cook, “that the AACR is the last code we shall see.”

On March 20, 1967, LC began to apply AACR to publications within the limits of superimposition. By September 1967, there were already additions and changes to AACR which had been approved by DCC and by LC. Near the end of 1968, William J. Welsh, director of LC’s Processing Department, indicated that LC had readied more than a dozen proposals for additions and changes for DCC’s consideration at the 1969 ALA Midwinter Meeting. At the same time, the library was also working on a revision of Chapter 12 of AACR, relating to motion pictures, and on a number of transliteration tables. As LC continued to take an increasing role in initiating code revision, one is reminded of Lucile Morsch’s indication that programs such as Shared Cataloging “cannot be delayed for decisions on new rules; the Library must have the authority and must take the responsibility to develop them as required to provide catalog entries promptly.”

As the additions and changes continued, the British concern over them was shown in the lead article of Catalogue & Index in April 1969, which claimed that some of the “amendments appeared to have the effect of undermining the principles of the original text.” It was suggested that the case for introducing substantial modifications to the principles “needed more evidence than any that had so far been presented.”

JULY, 1976
While emphasis originally had been on clarification of existing rules by including examples, adding explanatory footnotes, or rewording the rules, the emphasis in the 1970s changed to filling the lacunae as LC and DCC, with revision committees of Canada and Britain, devoted their attention primarily to the development of rules for nonbook materials. A Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files was investigating the formulation of rules for cataloging computer records. All of this only brought to light the need for more additions and revisions in the near future, and the need for a second edition of AACR became more evident. A subcommittee was proposed to consider this problem. By the July 1973 ALA meeting, DCC's proposal for code revision was accepted and the organization and objectives of this proposal were tentatively accepted by CCS, LC, the Canadian Library Association and the Library Association.

At the 1974 ALA Midwinter Meeting, the newly appointed ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee was shifted from the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) to division (Resources and Technical Service Division (RTSD)) committee status and given the authority for code revision until the publication of the second edition.

A short while later JSC was formed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. to reconcile in a single text the present North American Text and the British Text of the AACR;
2. to incorporate in the single text all amendments and changes since 1967 that have already been agreed upon and implemented by the authors under procedures following from the 1966 "Memorandum of Agreement on Catalog Code Revision between the American Library Association and the Library Association";
3. to consider for inclusion in the revision all work currently in process and all proposals for amendments by the authors of the revised text and national committees of other countries that use English versions of the AACR texts, that have been put forward by a date not later than seven months after the commencement of editorial work on the revision, and
4. to provide for international interests in AACR as made known to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR by the date mentioned in 3 above.

In July 1974, at its first meeting, JSC appointed Paul Winkler, Principal Descriptive Cataloger, Library of Congress, as the editor and Michael Gorman of the British Library as associate editor.
Four policy statements were adopted by JSC in January 1975. First, the second edition should maintain general conformity with the Paris Principles. Second, it should conform with ISBD(M) as the basic bibliographic description of monographs and to the ISBD principle of bibliographic description for all categories of materials. Third, it was resolved that the second edition should take particular account of developments in the machine processing of bibliographic records, neglected in the first edition. Fourth, JSC accepted the commitment entered into by the predecessors to base the revision of relevant chapters of Part III of AACR primarily on the following four sources: Draft Revisions of Chapters 12 and 14 of the AACR (U.S.); Non-Book Materials Cataloging Rules (U.K.); Nonbook Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collection (Canada); and Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials (U.S.).

The same article that reported the Council on Library Resources grant of $111,431 to ALA on behalf of JSC to complete the second edition of AACR also announced the CLR grant of $350,000 to the University of Chicago to achieve full operational status for its comprehensive data management system and to make it available for sharing with other libraries. An almost equal amount, $348,800, was granted to Stanford University to enable its BALLOTS system to be expanded into a California library automation network.

As yet, there is no truly electronic catalog, although some librarians are working toward making catalog holdings available in machine-readable form. Some librarians believe that rules such as we now have may no longer be required for the establishing of personal entries in such catalogs because truncated searches can accomplish retrieval regardless of the degree of fullness of an author's name. They see no need for adhering to principles of “book” and “work” or for the concept of authorship—indeed, the movement toward title entry, especially in regard to proposed rules for serials, is an open admission of computer accommodation (although the user's convenience is thrown in for good measure).

On the other hand, some catalogers are moving in the direction of authority files and book/work identification in automated catalogs based on principles. At a conference in October 1975, Michael Malinconico of the New York Public Library described an on-line catalog with collocation capabilities in regard to representations of the work. He recognized the intervention of the human cataloger to achieve the collocation, while Frederick Kilgour saw the on-line catalog as having much more power than the Paris Principles for
helping the user and therefore foresaw the end of the classical catalog in the immediate future. Just as in the past, there are differences of opinion today in the making of the catalog. The machine is and will be influential—but it cannot be the only consideration.

Concerning nonbook materials, the rules covered by AACR, Part III, were essentially those covered in the previous code. The intent was that the general principles and rules of the code could cover all materials with special rules necessary only when a medium required them. Lois Mai Chan says that Part III, "especially chapters 12, 14 and 15, has proved to be inadequate in coping with the proliferation, particularly in the range, of nonbook materials in recent years." In an attempt to fill the gap, Jean Riddle Weihs, Shirley Lewis and Janet Macdonald, in consultation with a number of organizations interested in rules for nonbook materials, prepared Nonbook Materials; The Organization of Integrated Collections, based on AACR principles. This publication, as well as the revised Chapter 12 ("Audiovisual Media and Special Instructional Materials") published in late 1975, have been received as basic documents for the revision of AACR.

The new code is projected for 1977. That date leaves little time for its discussion by a profession which has been, in the past, much engaged in code revision.

Even as work on AACR2 continues, the CCS Policy and Research Committee contemplates AACR3. Fearing that present revision efforts are being conducted in a fragmentary manner, the committee has called for basic research "to insure that future code revisions can be based upon and reflect the results of objective research." Named as topics for research were "catalog use and user preferences; the form of catalog entries including headings and tracings; the structure and style of catalog records including card catalogs, book catalogs, and computer catalogs; the relationship between manual and machine bibliographic records; and the relationship between form and/or type of material, cataloging treatment, and patterns of use." Now would be the time to begin such studies.

THE LOCAL LIBRARY

Although Network can report that "the 1967 AACR has played a significant role in English-speaking countries in standardizing the choice of entry, form of heading, and physical description of library materials," how much effect do codes have upon local libraries which also have obligations and responsibilities to their users?
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Apparently, in some libraries, codes have little or no effect. For example, Virginia Woll Atwood found in a study of university and college libraries in regard to adoption of AACR that, while no large university library had disregarded the code, "of the small college librarians . . . almost a third have totally disregarded the code and continue to operate under earlier rules." Neal Edgar reported after a November 1, 1974, meeting of the Akron Area Librarians Association and the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians to discuss changes in catalog rules that of approximately 120 persons showing interest in code revision, only three in the audience indicated current use of AACR.

Codes exist to give general guidelines for recurring situations found in library materials. They are helpful in achieving a degree of standardization within an individual catalog or whenever it is desirable to achieve cooperation between libraries. Codes are not laws however; even if they were, as they have been written, they would not prove to be so inflexible as to result in completely uniform application. Catalogers bring individual interpretations to both the materials and the rules. "Catalogs are complex because people and books are complex," William W. Bishop advised students at the New York State Library School in 1915. He went on to identify the problems of descriptive cataloging and concluded that "somehow these must be treated with a degree of uniformity and common sense.

While codes may attempt to provide uniformity, only the cataloger with a concern for local users can apply the common sense required. How both the uniformity and the common sense should be applied will vary with the form and function of the catalog, the other bibliographical tools and materials available, the size of the collection and the catalog, the filing arrangement (in a manual catalog at least) and, of course, the users.

Among the total topics covered in one hundred years of cataloging literature, treatment of the making of a catalog of integrity for users seems sparse. Much more than the acceptance of bibliographical data from another source is implied in the act of compiling such a catalog. Herbert Putnam had hinted of this in his speech before ALA just prior to the issuance of LC cards to other libraries. Referring to the cards, he stated that: "The usefulness of copies of them to any other library for incorporation in its catalogs must depend upon local conditions; the style, form, and size of its own cards, the number of books which it adds yearly, the proportion of these which are current and other related matters."
Despite the great response to the sale of LC printed cards, not all libraries availed themselves of this service for a variety of reasons, and for many materials LC cataloging was not available. For many years the percentage of foreign books covered by LC cataloging was small and coverage still is not available for many kinds of media. Many of the libraries preparing their own catalog entries were school and small public libraries for whom an abridged code was often requested but never issued. In his work, *Milestones in Cataloging*, Donald Lehnus cites the popularity of five American cataloging manuals which were among the fourteen most frequently cited works in his citation study of cataloging literature.\(^{166}\) Because of their frequent citation and because the same authors also wrote in the literature and were active in the profession, their suggestions undoubtedly influenced many librarians. For these reasons, the works of Theresa Hitchler, Jennie Dorcas Fellows, William W. Bishop, Susan Gray Akers, and Margaret Mann were studied here, as well as the more recent manual of Esther J. Piercy, revised by Marion Sanner.\(^{167}\)

Although these manuals were often written for beginners or "untrained" persons, they usually carried a philosophy about making a catalog to serve the user. Even though the form of name might be taken from the title page, the cataloger was encouraged to use a uniform form of the name that was full enough to be clear and to distinguish one person from another. In the manuals of Fellows, Akers and Piercy, which attempted to follow contemporary catalog codes, rules for choice of entry and form of name were usually simplified and abbreviated from the codes themselves. In a sense, they served as surrogate codes.

For descriptive cataloging, the manuals often suggested an abbreviated form for transcription of the title and other title-related information. The place of publication was usually not considered important and the publisher was abbreviated. The copyright date however, was considered essential. Collation was usually restricted to the last numbered arabic page, the term "illus." usually sufficed except for certain kinds of publications, for which the use of "map" and "ports." was suggested. Size, which had caused early librarians so much concern, was usually omitted. A series statement and notes were used if important; contents notes were among the most frequently mentioned notes, especially for literary works.

When printed cards were not used, different kinds of entries often were of different fullness. The main entry was the full entry. Subject entries were often full so that the user interested in many books all on
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the same subject was not required to refer to many main entry cards for full information. Harriet D. MacPherson made the following synthesis about other secondary entries:

All other secondary types, such as those for editor, joint author, title, etc., were given only in skeleton form, with the understanding that the reader would use the added entry card for ready reference only, and refer back to the main entry for all detailed information. . . . The shortening of the secondary entry card generally involved merely placing the author's initials in the heading and omitting notes, either entirely or in part; sometimes other items, such as a portion of the title, the edition, the imprint (except the date), and the entire collation, were omitted as well. If many notes or other items were omitted a blanket stamp referring the reader to the main entry card for further information was often used. 168

Fiction cards in the smaller libraries were frequently very brief; often only author and title were recorded. Added entry points of access were to be made if "useful." They seldom were to be made for editors, compilers or translators.

In the days of manuscript cards, a ruled card was often used. Bishop, who saw his manual as being written from the administrative viewpoint, encouraged the use of cards "ruled with the top and two sides in red" 169 for all manuscript cards. The computer brought back an old practice from the days of manuscript or typed cards—that is, using a different form for each type of entry.

Shortened forms used abbreviations and punctuation known only to catalogers. Fellows recognized them as time-saving for the cataloger who knew their meanings, but not helpful to the user. 170 (In the 1970s the same difficulty was recognized in regard to ISBD punctuation.)

Another source of descriptive cataloging data also came from centralized or commercial cataloging and/or processing centers. For thirty-five years, the H.W. Wilson Company issued catalog cards and included the cataloging data in their Standard Catalog series. Although the cards are no longer available, the cataloging data is still included in other of Wilson's services. 171 In recent years, the entries reflected the form of name on the title page; the descriptive cataloging was brief; imprint consisted of a brief form of the publisher's name and the date; and collation included arabic paging and a brief statement of illustrations. No doubt this pattern influenced many
libraries using Wilson cards when it was necessary to make their cards locally.

In a study of commercial processing firms, Barbara Westby reported that the title-page form of name was used almost exclusively: "This results in variations in the entry for a single author if his name is printed differently in his books, e.g., Smith, J.J.; Smith, James J.; and Smith, James John. Only a few firms maintain name authority files; and cross-references for names and subjects are seldom furnished." She reminded the local cataloger that there was work to be done in making the catalog even if cards were purchased. From examples in her study and from those obtained elsewhere, one notes the same lack of publisher and size and the use of a brief title as called for by the manuals cited above. Brief annotations are often used.

A study of cataloging in the National Union Catalog series also shows variation in descriptive cataloging data used. Indeed, both Hastings in the 1930s and Dewton some thirty years later raised complaints about the entries supplied by different libraries to cooperative ventures. Dewton went so far as to say that a large part of the cataloging done by American libraries did not live up to expected standards.

With the computer came the possibility of suppressing information on certain records and of formatting different records in different ways. This proved to be particularly useful in book catalog production. A great variety can be found in recent book catalogs because they have been made for many different types of libraries. In their study, Tauber and Feinberg found that:

The amount of information included in the entries varies in different book catalogs. Some include all the information appearing on the catalog card, others limit the entries to what may be considered as the minimum elements. . . . Entries may be shortened by such practices as the use of abbreviations for name of publishers and other elements, by use of initials for authors instead of the full form of name, by limiting the title to a specified number of characters and by limiting descriptive cataloging.175

Not all libraries follow rules exactly as written. One large university library entered corporate names under the form used at time of publication long before AACR sanctioned this practice. Even after AACR's appearance, some libraries continued to catalog serials under latest title, while others used successive titles long before AACR. A smaller university library finds LC summaries for audiovisual materials inappropriate for its use and therefore writes its own. A univer-
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sity library with a computer-produced book catalog, where all information is keyed into the computer, alters descriptive cataloging to conform to the latest practice as well as providing main entries to agree with the revision of AACR rules 3-5. A cataloger for a school processing center finds the need to add additional subject headings for her system. An art library/museum cataloger makes many more added entries than AACR calls for.

While not much may be written about the adaptations of local libraries to meet the needs of their users—perhaps because standardization is so much the watchword these days—the making of a catalog of integrity for the local user does continue. Centralized and commercialized services and systems like OCLC do not currently generate cross references, do not match the entries to forms existing in local catalogs, nor do they perform any of the myriad of details that make the difference between a catalog and a mere listing of individual authors and titles. There is little need to modify perfectly good bibliographical data used in description of the physical item simply because it goes beyond that ordinarily provided locally or because it differs in form. There may be local needs, however, which call for going beyond that provided on standardized cataloging data. Here could be mentioned the need for contents (sparsely presented on LC cards); the need for added entries that exceed the "rule of three" in cataloging codes and in LC practice; and the need for analytics brought about by changes in publishing, the lack of prompt indexing in other tools, and the needs of specialized users.

In the future, local libraries will still need to supply cataloging for items for which the need is uniquely local. Even the Library of Congress realizes that "it can supply no more than 75-80 percent of the cataloging information that is required nationally" and that "it will never acquire some bibliographic items; for example, many state and local documents, the output of minor publishers, and various publications in specialized fields."176

An encouraging development is the LC publication of Names with References and the prospect of LC authority information being distributed in machine-readable form. The research done by the national library can become a powerful tool in many local libraries either using or adapting the information. The use of the computer should enable local libraries also to provide information for their users in a way never before possible, and to update or change some kinds of entries rapidly. But the local library must set the priorities for itself.

Until recently, relatively few changes occurred in the form of the
catalog in the century under review. It was the time of the dictionary card catalog; in the future, however, we shall certainly see all types of catalogs—book, microform, card, on-line—or a mix of several types. Regardless of form, what we must learn from history is to consider the user and the bibliographical data for the one tool that has been made specifically for the local user.

A SHORT LOOK AT A LONG TIME: SYNTHESIS

Descriptive cataloging is concerned to a large extent with the choice and form of bibliographical data elements necessary to provide access to the items in the collection, and to describe and identify the items for purposes of selection or rejection by the user.

Alternative methods exist by which to provide access, determine the forms of names, and describe and identify the items. Because of this fact, some persistent problems have recurred throughout the century: real name vs. pseudonym; editor vs. titles; entry under place vs. entry under the name of an institution; transcription in title-page order vs. transcription in a prescribed order. Each has its advantages and disadvantages.

The card form of the catalog has prevailed in this period of history. It did not appear overnight, nor will it disappear overnight. Much has happened, however, in the last fifteen years to lead to the conclusion that the catalog may appear in many forms in the future—even within the same library. Since form of the catalog can affect descriptive cataloging, this point cannot be overlooked.

To determine which of the alternative methods of access, forms of name, etc. to choose or which forms of the catalog to use, the function of the catalog must be predetermined. Even after one hundred years function is not well defined. There may be different functions for different libraries, although there is likely to be some commonality of function for many libraries of the same nature, size, or user population. Any one library must remain flexible enough to respond to the needs of its users and define its own functions if necessary. The computer should be helpful in providing flexibility, but human intervention is necessary to recognize the need.

User studies have usually been related to a particular library. However, any one user may have different needs at different times. What little is known about users seems sometimes to have been ignored in cataloging codes.

Codes are not laws, although some librarians have interpreted them
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as such. They seem to move more in the machine age toward achievement of some degree of more rigid standardization on national and international levels. Modern technology should free the local library to alter standardized services more easily, should the functions of the library and the needs of users require this. Standardization to communicate on one level need not mean uniformity in all libraries.

Politics and rhetoric have been a part of descriptive cataloging practices as they have been a part of all of life. Often the literature, especially during times of code revision, has been filled with attempts "to sell the product." We have not escaped what Robert A. Fairthorne calls "salesmanship without responsibility" any better than have others in the information revolution. On the other hand, those who have had ideas and have not made them evident may have, in their lethargy, robbed the profession of solutions we could have used.

William Dix, librarian emeritus of Princeton University, recently wrote a short paragraph on the presentation of the 1975 Esther J. Piercy award to John D. Byrum, current chairperson of CCRC. Dix noted that this "may be the age of the cataloger." He sees the cataloger as a "library professional with a firm intellectual grasp of theory and insistence upon high standards, and a recognition of the opportunities offered by new attitudes and new technology." As other bibliographical tools move toward acceptance of the same standards and principles as those used in making the catalog, Cutter's golden age of cataloging may be not over, but just arriving.
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