A few limitations to this paper should be stated at the outset. First, this is an analytical and historical overview of the need for standards in rare book work and of the development of such standards. (Rare book work is meant in a very broad context and involves work with rare books, serials, manuscripts, graphics, and even realia.) For a philippic on these and related matters, see Stephen Paul Davis's paper in this issue of *Library Trends*. Second, the standards discussed are those pertaining to cataloging, not those which might be used with other aspects of rare book work. Uniform order or claims forms are not under consideration here, nor are standards for professional ethics (to go further afield), nor standards for the transfer of materials from general collections to special collections. A final limitation is chronological. The word *automated* in the title of this paper confines us to the last fifteen or twenty years or since the development and implementation of Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC). We are further limited by the fact that most developments in rare book standards have occurred only in the last eight years or since the publication of the Independent Research Libraries Associations's *Proposals* in 1979.¹ Within these limitations, the scope of this article is an examination of what standards are, where they are needed in cataloging, why they are needed, how they have evolved, and how they may continue to evolve.

Standards can be described as instructions for doing something uniformly. In cataloging, these instructions are for a uniform way of
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describing a book (or other object) and for uniform ways of retrieving the descriptive record. Cataloging standards thus allow for uniformity of identity and uniformity of means of access. Identity means the bibliographic description of a book—i.e., the transcription of its title and author statement, imprint, collation, and notes. By "means of access" is meant what are usually termed access points, or names, terms, etc. associated with the bibliographic description that allow it to be retrieved. Examples of these access points are main and added entries, subject tracings, citations to bibliographies, and terms indicating such things as genre and illustrative technique.

Why are standards needed? To put it simply, in order to communicate. Standardized descriptions are necessary if the holdings of the library are to be properly identified and communicated; standardized access points are necessary for collocation, or bringing like materials together. This communication occurs within a library—between catalogers, other staff members, and users of the library's collections—and between a library and other libraries, institutions, and potential users. Communication cannot take place without a shared language; in cataloging that language is a set of accepted standards.

To demonstrate why standards are needed let us look at some examples of how a lack of standards, or different standards, have impeded identification of materials and access to them. Problems with identification will be examined first and then problems with access.

The first example is that of a lack of standards and is taken from various entries in the National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints. This catalog has been edited to ensure uniformity of choice and form of entry: with a few exceptions given in the introduction to volume one, all main entries have been brought into conformity with the rules for choice and form of entry found in the 1949 A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. However, a standard for bibliographical description has not been imposed, nor could it be without an examination of the books themselves. Records contributed by many hundreds of libraries include descriptions based on standards found in quite a number of published cataloging codes; some descriptions seem to be based on local or in-house standards; and a few descriptions seem to be clipped from booksellers' catalogs. As a result of the attempt to select only one of these descriptions as a master record for each edition (or, in some cases, issue), two things have happened that obscure bibliographical identity. In some cases the same edition or issue is represented by more than one master record, it being impossible to tell because of the lack of a standard of bibliographic description whether or not the same edition or issue was being described in the different contributed records. A more serious
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problem is the conflation of records for different editions or issues under a single master record: this is only sometimes apparent, as when the record for another library has been selected for the master record, the symbol for your library has been added as a holding location, and yet your library holds a different edition or issue of that title.

Different standards can also impede the identification of materials. An example of this is the specification in all editions of the ALA cataloging rules that the size of the book be given as the last element of the collation. The British have traditionally preferred to give the format of the book instead. These two approaches to one aspect of the physical description of a book result in records that are not at all interchangeable, nor in many cases, comparable, at least in this aspect of their descriptions. As a result, a British librarian with records for two editions of a book distinguishable only by format (say octavo and quarto) could not tell which edition was being described by an American library which recorded only that it measured 19 cm.

A final example of how different standards of description can impede identification can be found in the contrasting provisions of two current catalog codes for rare books: those prepared by the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue project (ESTC), and those prepared by the Library of Congress (LC) Bibliographic Description of Rare Books (BDRB). ESTC prescribes giving the number of plates in a book only when they are numbered; otherwise that part of the collation is to read simply “plates”; BDRB specifies that the number of plates is always to be given. A cataloger using BDRB and attempting to describe a perfect copy when an unknown number of plates is missing in his copy would not be helped in this regard by an ESTC record. The statement “plates” in the collation would also be unhelpful to a researcher interested in consulting only one of several issues of a book when those issues could be distinguished only by the number of plates in each. ESTC also prescribes that blank leaves not be included in the collation; BDRB prescribes that they should be. Unless notes are required in either code (which they are not), the resulting dissimilar collations will seem to indicate variants. A final example of the disparity of approaches taken by these sets of cataloging rules is in their treatment of supplying a date of publication to an undated book. BDRB, following the examples given in the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2d ed. (AACR2), allows a broad, and perhaps vague, approach to giving imprint dates. A book probably printed in the eighteenth century should have the date [17--]; one probably printed in the 1730s would have the date [173-?]; etc. One probably published between two dates less than twenty years apart may be assigned a date such as [between 1718 and 1730]. ESTC takes an
entirely different approach: all dates are to be expressed in four digits. A book probably published between 1708 and 1712 is to have the imprint date [1710?]; the same imprint date is to be assigned to those probably published between 1705 and 1715 or between 1700 and 1720. This does not at all lead to a compatibility of records or bibliographic identity even when both methods of description (in this and other matters) are understood and kept perfectly in mind.

To turn to access, two examples of how the lack of standards, or of different standards, can impede access to materials will perhaps suffice. The first example, or rather series of examples, involves a lack of standards and will show how certain libraries attempt to provide access to their collections by means of special access points before the MARC formats had allowed them to do so in a uniform and universal way. One library maintained all of its special files manually while regular cataloging was done using MARC. The number of cards needed for, in this case, chronology, provenance, press, and collection files were counted up at the time of card production; that many extra cards were obtained. A record was kept on the cataloging work form of how many extra cards were needed and what headings were to be typed on each. When the card set arrived, the headings were typed (with corresponding tracings on main entry and shelflist cards) and the cards were filed. There were two major problems with this approach: (1) it required a great deal of labor and record-keeping; and (2) it failed to bring the library's entire record for a book under computer control so that the card catalog remained the central record of the library's holdings and an archival computer tape was largely worthless.

Another library appropriated all of the local subject fields (MARC tags 690-693) for its files. They were delegated as follows: 690 for chronology and techniques of illustration; 691 for place of publication; 692 (person) and 693 (corporate body) for provenance, printers, and bookbinders. This is at least computer cataloging: the files are represented on an archive tape and can be searched. In one case a successful combination search was made, using the archive tape, for books with aquatints published between 1785 and 1815. This would not have been possible with the library's card catalog. And yet this approach too had its drawbacks: local subjects had nowhere to go, there was not a one-to-one correspondence of tags and files, and much free-text searching was required.

A third library devised the following plan: printers, presses, and names of former owners were put in field 700 or 710 as appropriate. The name of the printer, etc., was preceded by subfield g and a two or three letter code for the appropriate file. Binding types and chronology trac-
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ings were put in field 630 with a similar preceding code. This was probably the most effective of the three approaches, although even here field 630 was inappropriately used, and the special file cards had to be removed from the main catalog sequence.

The real problem with all three plans is that they were local solutions peculiar to that library, and in all cases computer access to these data (when possible) required specialized programming. Perhaps most importantly, shared cataloging was not being fully shared, and specialized access was not being provided outside the library.

An example of how different standards can impede access to materials can be seen in the results of the simultaneous use of two different thesauri for genre terms that have been published within the past few years. Both list terms which, when added to field 655 of a MARC record, allow access to that record to a researcher seeking items of a certain genre (e.g., penny dreadfuls, or farewell sermons). One thesaurus, *Genre Terms*, was prepared by the Standards Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). It is a list which may be used to identify the intellectual (as opposed to physical) genres of all types of materials, including both books and manuscripts. Two years later the Research Libraries Group (RLG) published *Form Terms for Archival and Manuscripts Control*. It listed both intellectual and physical genres and was intended to be used with the MARC format for archives and manuscripts although it can be used with other formats including books. Thus terms in either list could be used to describe intellectual genres of manuscripts and archives. What is the problem? The lists are not at all coordinated, and the same concept may be found expressed in different terms in the two lists. Thus we have, for example, RLG’s bills (legislative), catalogues, and librettos v. the Standards Committee’s bills, catalogs, and libretti, and the approaches taken to identify types of journals are entirely incompatible. The result is that a researcher trying to retrieve certain genres of archives and manuscripts will be impeded in his/her search by the existence and use of two different standards for identifying such genres.

It is hoped that these examples, along with the preceding remarks, demonstrate the necessity of standards, especially in an automated environment. Happily, standards already exist for most important areas of rare book work, and this paper concludes with an examination of how they have developed. This examination is divided into two parts: standards for bibliographic description and standards for access.

The historical development of a code or codes for the bibliographic description of rare books is very recent: until this decade none had been
published. There have been various catalogs, handbooks, treatises, and cataloging codes that could be used in whole or in part with profit in treating rare books. Cataloging rules for certain subsets of rare books (notably for incunabula) have been used since the nineteenth century, but these could not be used, even if they were published and available, with all rare books in a library's collection. There have been general rules in which little or no attention to rare books was given: Panizzi's of 1841; Cutter's of 1875; ALA's in 1908, 1941, and 1949; AACR in 1967; and AACR2 in 1979. Finally, there have been a few treatises (Paul S. Dunkin's How to Catalog a Rare Book is probably the best known) and the specialized bibliographers' handbooks by McKerrow, Bowers, and Gaskell.

The information given in these publications was either inadequate or too restrictive for most collections of rare books. As a result, each library has gone its own way until quite recently, usually adapting in-house one of the sets of rules, especially the 1941 ALA rules, or AACR, or AACR2.

This was no problem until the late 1960s and early 1970s when computers and networks first appeared in libraries. Although slow to take to computer cataloging, most rare book libraries eventually saw the benefits, the main ones being: (1) multiple use of a single effort to reproduce cataloging, and (2) consistent posting of holdings information to an online union catalog. To achieve these benefits a uniform standard of bibliographic description using MARC was necessary, and no such standard existed. (It was imperative to use MARC since it had been designed for the international communication of cataloging data in computer-based systems.)

The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) was the first to develop such a standard. A little background first: descriptive cataloging codes for preparing machine-readable records for many types of materials (including rare books) began to be created soon after the first presentation by IFLA of the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications or ISBD(M) in 1973. The impetus for a code for older materials was the attempted and unsatisfactory use of the MARC format in cataloging projects at the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Bodleian, and the National Library of Scotland in the early 1970s. The problems with MARC were again noticeable with the beginning of the ESTC project in 1976. But even before this time it was realized that the problems were not so much with MARC as with ISBD(M), in which it was specifically stated that its standardized form of description for international
exchange of bibliographic data was applicable primarily to current materials.

An IFLA committee began work on a code for rare books (eventually called *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Older Monographic Publications [Antiquarian]* or ISBD[A]⁸) in 1975. It was modeled on the *International Standard Bibliographic Description, Annotated Text* or ISBD(G),⁹ a skeleton code that was the basis of a number of specialized codes, which itself had only been published in 1975.

From the start the IFLA committee paid particular attention to the accurate transcription of the title and a complete collation. As finally published in 1980, the rules call for an exact transcription of the title (if transpositions are made, they are to be noted), and a collation in which every page, printed or not, is to be counted. No rules of application are firmly given (a cutoff date of 1801 is suggested); libraries are to decide for themselves what types, classes, or categories of books are to be cataloged using ISBD(A).

The purpose of the code is “to aid the international communication of bibliographic information” by (1) making records from different sources interchangeable; (2) helping the interpretations of records across language barriers; (3) assisting in encoding records in machine-readable form; and (4) providing precise transcription of title to identify works.

Before ISBD(A) was completed, the ESTC project had begun. This project, which is still underway, is an attempt to identify, and provide bibliographic records for, all eighteenth-century books printed in Great Britain and her colonies, or printed in English anywhere. (Full information on ESTC will be found in Alston and Jannetta’s book¹⁰ on the project, which includes an early version of the ESTC cataloging rules.) Since no rare book cataloging rules had been published, ESTC developed its own based on a version of MARC used in the United Kingdom. Its rules were relatively simple, as befitted a short title catalog, and were not of universal application since they were only designed to be used to describe eighteenth-century English books.

The work on ISBD(A) and especially the ESTC projects involved many American librarians who in the late 1970s began to push for a national rare book cataloging code. The burden of preparing it was accepted by the Library of Congress.

The first draft of the code was distributed in December 1979 as *Rules for Bibliographic Description of Early Printed Books, Pamphlets, Broadsides, and Single Sheets*. It was to be used in the descriptive
cataloging of all rare and special collections books at LC no matter how old; in cases of doubt there was an arbitrary cutoff date of 1801. It was emphasized that other libraries might want to use it and might want to apply it in the same way.

The rules were an attempt to incorporate provisions of ISBD(A) into a framework of AACR2 (the two had not been coordinated earlier because AACR2 was being finished at the same time ISBD(A) was beginning). The rules include some material present in neither code but compatible with both. An accurate transcription of title (with notes to indicate transposition) and a collation that accounts for every page, printed or not, are features the rules share with ISBD(A). The final form of the code was published in December 1980 with the much more sensible title Bibliographic Description of Rare Books.¹¹

BDRB was in turn the impetus for some other specialized descriptive cataloging codes which were to be used, in whole or in part, with rare materials. These codes include those for cataloging graphic materials,¹² archives and manuscripts,¹³ and rare serials.¹⁴

There still remained the second problem of attempting to provide access points customarily found in rare book libraries while using the MARC format which didn’t provide places for them. These access points have collectively been called special files: they allow a book to be found through its provenance, printer, publisher, place or date of publication, etc.

Some libraries did not even attempt to provide special file access in computer-aided cataloging; some continued manual cataloging because they considered such access invaluable and could not figure out how to supply it when using the MARC format. Many, if not most, libraries using MARC made strained efforts to get this information (and access to it) into their records.

Realizing that these and similar attempts were unsatisfactory, a small group formed to try to effect changes in the MARC format. It was a committee of the Independent Research Libraries Association (IRLA), an organization of mostly small, private libraries. Established late in 1978, its name was the Ad Hoc Committee on Standards for Rare Book Cataloguing in Machine-Readable Form and it consisted of members of IRLA and representatives from LC and a computer software company.

Its immediate impetus was the problems that developed during the ESTC pilot project at the New York Public Library. Some things wanted in that project were not available because of limitations of the project’s software or limitations of the MARC format or both. The committee thus met to formulate ways to get information important to rare book libraries into machine-readable records. Its first meeting was
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in March 1979; it issued an interim report in September of that year and distributed it to 150 British and American libraries. Their comments were reviewed in October, and a revised and final report was published in December. Most of its work was then passed on to the newly formed Standards Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries.

The committee's final report consisted of fifteen proposals. Most of these concern standardized access, and they are summarized here with an outline of action taken to date.

Proposals one through six were submitted to LC's Automated Systems Office where they were discussed with representatives of the National Library of Canada and the networks. They were then presented by LC to ALA's Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI). Proposals one through five were for changes in the MARC formats for books, maps, music, and serials; proposal six was for the books format only. Proposals one through six, if accepted by MARBI, appeared in published form in the updates to the MARC formats.

The first proposal (IRLA proposal one) was to add a new field 655 to record a term indicating the genre of a work. The field would have topical, place, and chronological subdivisions. It was the experience of the committee that with older materials, access is often sought through the type of work a publication is—e.g., a sermon—rather than through conventional author, title, or subject approaches. A draft thesaurus of terms for field 655 was given in IRLA proposal eleven.

The proposal was accepted by MARBI in March 1980 and it was published in the updates to the MARC formats. Terms in the field may only be taken from a published genre thesaurus. Preparation of such a list for rare books was entrusted to the RBMS Standards Committee. For an account of the publication of this and other thesauri, see the summary of action taken on IRLA proposal eleven.

IRLA proposal two suggested a new field (752) for place of publication or printing recorded in an indirect fashion (e.g., United States—Pennsylvania—Philadelphia), since this access could not be satisfactorily retrieved from field 260 no matter which cataloging code had been used to prepare the record. Also proposed was a subfield j in 752, so that this field could be linked with one or more 700/710/711 fields that contained names of individual printers, publishers, etc. Thus the combination

700 10 Franklin, Benjamin, #d 1706-1790, #e printer and 752 United States #b Pennsylvania #d Philadelphia #j 700/1
would link the Philadelphia place of printing with the printer Franklin, and allow one to retrieve books printed in Philadelphia by Franklin. IRLA estimated that this linking was important in about 15 percent of early imprints where two or more places of publication and two or more publishers, etc., were present.

The proposal was accepted by MARBI in March 1980 with one modification—that subfield j be deleted. It felt that the technique of linking had been developed for only a few specialized fields, and that it would rather not expand it further, awaiting instead a general solution to linking that could apply to all fields throughout the MARC formats.

IRLA proposal three requested field 751 for a direct recording of the place of printing or publication—e.g., Philadelphia (Penn.)—with the same subfield j linking device. The field was to be used by libraries that preferred direct access to place of printing or publication.

This was withdrawn from consideration by MARBI by mutual consent of LC and MARBI. The latter was unwilling to define two fields for the same information arranged differently. It also thought that the direct form could be automatically derived from indirect form as recorded in field 752. The proposal is considered dead by the Standards Committee.

Proposal four was concerned with copy-specific information, especially access by donors, provenance, and binders. Three new fields (790-792) were recommended to accommodate personal, corporate, and conference forms of names associated with a specific copy of a work. An important feature of these fields was subfield 5, which allowed a library (using its National Union Catalog symbol) to be identified with copy-specific information. For example

```
790 1 Blathers, Moira, #d 1898-1956, #e former owner #5 TxU
```

would indicate that the University of Texas copy of the book belonged to Blathers.

This proposal was only accepted provisionally by MARBI in March 1980 since it was unwilling to commit itself to setting up new fields for copy-specific information until the whole problem of accommodating such information in the MARC formats is solved. LC, the networks, and the National Library of Canada then suggested putting copy-specific added entries in the existing 700-740 fields with a new indicator 4 to show their nature; they also wished to retain subfield 5.

MARBI again discussed the issues in 1981 and accepted the proposal with modifications. The new indicator 4 was dropped, but subfield 5 was retained. Copy-specific entries are to be put in fields 700-740. Directions for the use of subfield 5, which can also be used with notes,
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appeared in the updates to the MARC formats.

IRLA proposal five suggested a new field 755 for the recording of publishing or physical aspects of a work. A real grab-bag of terms was proposed for this field, deemed most useful to historians of the book. Following are the categories of terms, with an example from each:

- Publishing/bookselling (Large paper edition)
- Paper and papermaking (Watermark-Lion)
- Printing (Press figures)
- Typographic (Fraktur)
- Illustration (Chromoxylograph)
- Binding (Vellum)
- Provenance evidence (Autograph)
- Miscellaneous (Extra-illustrated)

It was thought that subfield $j$ could again function as a linking device especially in the case of provenance evidence which could be tied to the name of a former owner. Subfield 5 was also needed to identify copy-specific entries. IRLA realized that the lists contained a mixture of copy-specific and general terms but despaired of separating them.

This proposal was withdrawn from consideration before MARBI because of copy-specific problems (see discussion under IRLA proposal four), questions concerning the use of subfield $j$ (see under IRLA proposal two), and the lack of thesauri or the prospect of any. The proposal was referred to the RBMS Standards Committee, which reworked it, dropping the requests that copy-specific information be identified, and that links with other fields be allowed. The revised proposal was resubmitted to MARBI and accepted. For an account of the lists of terms prepared for field 755, see the summary of action taken on IRLA proposal eleven.

IRLA proposal six requested a new field 309 for copy-specific collation (to be used in addition to the existing field 300). It was not presented to MARBI at the request of the Standards Committee. After some discussion, the committee decided to drop the proposal since it felt that this information could just as easily be recorded in a note.

Proposals seven through fifteen were mainly attempts to standardize terminology for the new access points requested in proposals one, four, and five. They included preliminary lists and thesauri which were referred to the Standards Committee for further work and eventual publication.

IRLA proposal seven was addressed to LC, the Council on Library Resources, the networks, and the Standards Committee. It asked them all to work toward accommodating copy-specific information within
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the MARC format; it also specifically called for consideration to be
given to this problem in the LC/Council on Library Resources review
of the MARC format, which was then just beginning.

IRLA proposal eight was addressed to the Standards Committee
which was asked to review and refine an attached list of relator terms
(terms designating the function of a person associated with a book, such
as printer, illustrator, or former owner). The revised list would then be
submitted to the appropriate agency of ALA with the idea of amending
AACR2 to allow the use of relator terms from the list. IRLA felt that
some rare book libraries wanted to segregate the different functions of a
person in their catalogs (e.g., separate the books that William Morris
wrote, illustrated, printed, or owned) and that relator terms were neces-
sary for such segregation.

The Standards Committee assigned an editor to the list, circulated
and revised it, and published it. The committee then asked ALA's
Committee on Cataloging to permit the usage of the terms; approval
was forthcoming. Meanwhile, LC had informed the Standards Commit-
tee that it will use at least some of the relator terms.

IRLA proposal nine asked LC and the Standards Committee to
press for new characters in MARC's expanded character set, specifically:
superscript a and b (to indicate columns); superscript r and v (for recto
and verso); π and x (for signatures); and || (for line endings). No action
has been taken on this proposal.

IRLA proposal ten was addressed to LC, MARBI, and the net-
works, and asked that a filing override mechanism be developed in the
MARC format so that records could be organized in a bibliographically
significant way. It was recognized that the information needed to govern
the filing order of records was sometimes not in a place where the
computer could take it into account (e.g., in a note giving a bibliogra-
phic reference) and that a device could be developed (as it had been for
ESTC) to allow a library to machine file some records in the way it
wanted to. There has been no action taken on this proposal; it is possible
that an expansion of the uniform title fields will be a more likely
development than the formulation of a new device.

IRLA proposal eleven presented drafts of genre and illustration/
graphic technique lists to the Standards Committee. The drafts were
prepared in order to provide a standard vocabulary to guarantee internal
consistency in a library's records; to aid in shared cataloging; and to
facilitate future long-distance access to the records of other institutions.
The committee was asked to study, revise, publish, and maintain these
lists. It was also asked to investigate the development of comparable lists
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in the areas of publishing and bookselling; binding; typography; paper-making; and provenance.

A number of lists or thesauri have appeared to date. The Standards Committee prepared a general list of rare book genre terms;\(^{19}\) genre terms (as well as physical characteristic terms) have been developed for graphic materials;\(^{20}\) and a mixed bag of terms used to retrieve genres and forms of archives and manuscripts\(^{21}\) has appeared. The Standards Committee has also published lists of terms for printing and publishing evidence\(^{22}\) and binding styles and techniques;\(^{23}\) it is preparing thesauri for provenance evidence, papermaking, and type.

IRLA proposal twelve was addressed to LC and the Standards Committee; it asked for standardized citation forms for bibliographic references. After noting that a new field for bibliographic citations (510) had been approved for the MARC format, it recommended that citations for numbered reference works frequently consulted in rare book cataloging be standardized so that they could be employed as access points (like ISBNs). Such standard citations could also be used to generate lists of holdings of items recorded in such reference works. IRLA prepared a list of about 250 frequently cited works with suggested forms of citation and turned it over to the Standards Committee for further work. The committee agreed to undertake the task, but as it turned out the list was prepared at the Library of Congress although it was published with the committee's sanction.\(^{24}\)

IRLA proposal thirteen asked LC to put purely local notes in a local field and requested other libraries to do the same. LC has agreed and will put all local notes into field 590 (general) or 591 (bound with). Such notes will begin with a phrase such as LC copy: or Rosenwald copy:

IRLA proposal fourteen was addressed to LC (especially), the networks, and the Standards Committee. It asked that a nationwide authority system be set up so that AACR2 forms of names could be established quickly. It observed that new forms of entries for many older materials would not be established soon by LC and that many rare book libraries would need to set up such names before LC did. It suggested that some libraries be allowed to go ahead and establish such headings, possibly subject to LC's approval. Such a system has come to pass. A number of special collections, as well as the ESTC project, have contributed authority records.

IRLA proposal fifteen was directed to LC and the Standards Committee. It noted that the provisions for rare book cataloging in AACR2 were inadequate and that ISBD(A), while useful, was in some ways
incompatible with AACR2. It asked LC to develop rare book cataloging rules that would expand the small rare book section in AACR2. This, as we have seen, has been done.

Many methods of preparing and promulgating standards have been shown in this brief survey of the development of rare book standards to date. Some have been prepared by international bodies (IFLA) or projects (ESTC); some by national library organizations, or divisions, or committees of such organizations (ALA, ACRL, RBMS, and the Standards Committee of the latter section); some by institutions (LC); some, perhaps unwisely, by bibliographic utilities (RLG); and some have been private endeavors, although the latter have usually appeared in published form under the aegis of some organization or institution.

These various methods will undoubtedly continue to be used to develop such standards. All of these organizations, institutions, and even private endeavors welcome help, or at least are open to influence. Those wishing to initiate, influence, or even waylay a standard should be in contact.

Editor’s Note: A portion of this article is a revised version of material previously published by the author in Collecting and Managing Rare Law Books. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Glanvillc, 1981. Permission has been granted by the publisher for the use of this material.
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