

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

What is a Work? Part 3, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3w35865p>

Journal

Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 20(1)

Author

Yee, Martha M

Publication Date

1995

Peer reviewed

What Is a Work?

Part 3:

The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes

Martha M. Yee

ABSTRACT. Anglo-American codes are examined to determine the implicit or acting concept of work in each, in order to trace the development of our current implicit concept of work, as embodied in AACR2R. The following conditions are examined, using comparison tables: (1) same work with different appendages (illustrated works, music with text, texts with commentary and/or biographical/critical material, scholia); (2) separately published parts of a work produced by the exercise of several different functions; (3) appendages to a work published separately (commentaries without text, concordances, continuations, indexes, sequels, supplements); (4) change in title of a work. A trend away from the collocation of the editions of a work called for by the second objective of the catalog is identified. It is suggested that this tendency stems from failure to take advantage of newer technologies for building catalogs.

INTRODUCTION

In Part 2, we examined the way the condition of contraction of a work, and the condition of change in substance of a work have been handled by Anglo-American cataloging codes, in order to try to conceptualize the implicit or acting definitions of work in each code. In Part 3, we will examine the following conditions: (1) same work with

Martha M. Yee, MLS, PhD, is Cataloging Supervisor, UCLA Film and Television Archive, 1015 North Cahuenga, Los Angeles, CA 90038.

What Is a Work? Part 1: The User and the Objects of the Catalog appears in *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, Vol. 19(1) 1994. What Is a Work? Part 2: The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes appears in *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, Vol. 19(2) 1994.

different appendages; (2) separately published parts of a work produced by the exercise of several different functions; (3) appendages to a work published separately; and (4) change in title of a work.

**Same Work with Different Appendages:
Illustrated Works and Music with Text**

It can be seen from the following two Tables, that Anglo-American codes have consistently treated (1) the text as the work, which does not become a new work when issued with illustrations, and (2) the music as the work, which does not become a new work when issued with different texts.

CONDITION: Same work with different appendages

TYPE: Illustrated texts

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Cutter 1-4	x			When the illustrations form a very important part of a work, make full entry under both author of the text and designer of the plates.
Cutter 4	x			In a card catalog, consider the entry under the writer of the text the main entry.
Linderfelt	x			Same work unless illustrations are the chief feature of the book.*
1908 rules	x			Same work unless illustrations are the chief feature.*
Vatican (1938)	x			Same work unless the illustrations form the chief part of the book.*
1941 rules	x			Same work when the work has been independently written.**
1949 rules	x			Same as 1941 rules.**
CCR 1960	x			An illustrated edition of a work is considered the same work.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
AACR1	x			A work for which an artist has provided illustrations is entered under author.**
AACR2	x			Same as AACR1.**
AACR2R	x			Same as AACR1.**

*NOTE: It is presumed that the text of a work in which the illustrations are the chief feature would rarely be republished with different illustrations or with no illustrations; therefore these rules are considered to represent a concept of two editions of the same text with different illustrations as the same work.

**NOTE: These codes have rules for entry of works produced by the collaboration of artists and writers of text, as well as for entry of reproductions of works of art with text, which apply the criterion of predominance for determining entry. It is presumed that it is rare for the textual parts of such works to go into multiple editions with different illustrations or with no illustrations; therefore these rules are considered to conceptualize as the same work two editions of the same text with different illustrations or with no illustrations.

CONDITION: Same work with different appendages

TYPE: Music with text

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Jewett	x			
Cutter 1-4	x			Musical works entered doubly under the author of the words and the composer of the music.
Cutter 4	x			In a card catalog, the composer of the music will be considered the main entry.
1908 rules	x			Same as musical work without text.
Prussian Inst. (1908)	x			Same as musical work without text.
Vatican (1938)	x			Same as musical work without text.
1941 rules	x			Same as musical work without text.
1949 rules	x			Same as musical work without text.
AACR1	x			Same as musical work without text.
AACR2	x			Same as musical work without text.
AACR2R	x			Same as musical work without text.

Same Work with Different Appendages: Text with Commentary and/or Biographical/Critical Material—Scholia

Until the turn of the century, a text with commentary was automatically considered a manifestation of the work without commentary. The ALA rules of 1902 seem to have introduced the idea that the commentary could become so predominant over the text as to constitute a new work. Evident among other criteria for determining when the text with commentary is a new work is the criterion of representation.

CONDITION: Same work with different appendages

TYPE: Text with commentary and/or biographical/critical material—scholia.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Panizzi	x			
Jewett	x			
Cutter 1-3	x			Double entry under both author of text and commentator if title is in form Commentary on XYZ and not XYZ with a commentary.
Cutter 4			x	Mode of printing of text used in decision as to predominance; same work if text predominates.
LA 1883	x			
ALA condensed 1889	x			Same as Cutter 1-3.
Linderfelt	x			
Dewey 1890	x			
ALA 1902			x	Typographical disposition of text, and, in doubtful cases, title page representation, used to determine predominance; same work if text predominant.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
ALA 1904 1908 rules			x	Same as 1902.
			x	Typographical disposition; same work if text predominant.
Prussian Inst. (1908) Vatican (1938)	x			
			x	Same work unless commentary is of special importance because of extent or form of presentation and text is in smaller type at foot of page or below commentary or is given in part only.
Bodleian 1939			x	Same work unless text is subordinate to commentary as shown by typographical disposition or when emphasis is plainly on commentary.
1941 rules			x	Same work unless text is obviously subordinate to commentary as shown by typographical disposition or when printed in fragments only, or by intent of the author or publisher the emphasis is plainly on the commentary. LC practice: same work when text printed solid at beginning or end of book or across top or bottom of pages.
1949 rules			x	Same work unless text partial or fragmentary or obviously subordinate based on typographical disposition or emphasis given by author or publisher.
CCR 1960 AACR1	x			
			x	Text with biog./crit. material is diff. work if person responsible for biog./crit. mat. is represented as author, same work if person is represented as editor. In case of doubt, one named first is author. Text with commentary is same work if

CODE: SAME WORK DIFF. WORK DECISION CRITERIA

				represented on title page as edition of the work, or prefatory material indicates primary purpose is to provide an edition of the work, or text is more extensive than commentary, or commentary is typographically subordinate. Diff. work if presented on title page as commentary, or prefatory material indicates primary purpose is to provide a commentary, or commentary is more extensive than text, or text is typographically subordinate.
AACR2		x		Commentary: Same work if chief source presents as edition of original work; diff. work if chief source presents as commentary. If chief source ambiguous, decide based on prefatory material, typographic presentation, relative extent; in case of doubt, same work. Text with biog./crit. mat.: same work if biographer/critic represented as editor or compiler; diff. work if represented in chief source as a biog./crit. work.
AACR2R		x		Same as AACR2.

Separately Published Parts of a Work Produced by the Exercise of Several Different Functions

It could perhaps be argued that there has been a tendency in the 20th Century to marry various art forms in works which exhibit the work of more than one creator. The ultimate example of this is the film, which routinely exhibits the work of directors, writers, film editors, photographers, musicians, artists and performers. All of these functions can be studied separately, and many of the products

of these functions can be separated from the work and published separately, e.g., the sound track or the script. As the following Tables demonstrate, the trend is to consider such separately published parts as different related works.

CONDITION: Parts of a work produced by exercise of several different functions, such parts published separately.

TYPE: Text published from music (librettos)

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
1908 rules		x		
Prussian Inst. (1908)	x			
Vatican (1938)		x		
1941 rules			x	Libretto is same work unless there is no mention of composer or performance.
1949 rules			x	Libretto is same work unless there is no ascertainable connection between the text and a particular composer or performance.
AACR1		x		Libretto is same work unless it is published as a literary work or without reference to a particular musical setting. Option: Libretto is different work.
AACR2			x	Libretto is different work Option: libretto is same work unless published without reference to its musical setting.
AACR2R				Same as AACR2.

CONDITION: Parts of a work produced by exercise of several different functions, such parts published separately.

TYPE: Choreographies, illustrations published separately, incidental music to dramatic works, scripts

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Vatican (1938)		x		Illustrations to a work published separately.
1941 rules		x		Illustrations published separately; incidental music.
1949 rules			x	Choreography, illustrations, incidental music, scenarios for ballets, pantomimes or other dance compositions are all diff. works. Movie scripts are the same work as the movie. Radio scripts are diff. works from the program unless issued as a collection of scripts for a single program, or unless no author is named.
RDC. Pictures, 1959	x			Motion picture stills, same work as motion picture.
AACR1		x		Illustrations published separately, incidental music, motion picture stills. Scenarios, choreographies, radio and film scripts covered under single rule for "Related works."
AACR2		x		Illustrations published separately. Incidental music, scenarios, choreographies, radio and film scripts covered under single rule for "Related works." No more special rule for motion picture stills.
AACR2R		x		Same as AACR2.

**Appendages to a Work Published Separately:
Commentaries Without Text, Concordances, Continuations,
Indexes, Sequels, Supplements, Etc.**

These have tended from the beginning to be treated as different, related works, with some interesting exceptions, as shown by the following Table, notably the practice in English book catalogs of placing all of these with the entry for the work to which they relate, and, until AACR1, the use of dashed-on entries for continuations, appendixes, supplements and indexes. In AACR1, such works continued to be given the same main entry as the work to which they related if the former had dependent titles, but with AACR2, all are treated as different related works.

CONDITION: Appendages to a work published separately

TYPE: Commentaries without text, concordances, cotinuations, indexes, sequels, supplements, etc.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Panizzi		x		Commentary without text. Works not written by the person under whose name they are to be catalogued according to the foregoing rules, to be entered alphabetically as an appendix to the works of the author.
Jewett		x		Commentary without text.
Cutter 1-4		x		Continuation, index, concordance entered under both own author and author of work continued, indexed or concorded. Entry under the author concorded was to be regarded as a subject-entry, however.
LA 1883		x		Commentaries without text.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Bodleian 1889	x			Commentaries without the text, lexicons, indexes and concordances, dissertations, treatises, imitations, biographies, bibliographies, all arranged with the works of an author. Biographies entered under the subjects of them as well as under the authors.
Wheatley	x			Concordances are usually placed under the headings of the works to which they relate.
Linderfelt			x	Concordances, lexicons, commentary without text, and continuations in the form of an independent work with separate title are different works. The index to a work should be entered with such work.
Dewey 1890 1908 rules		x	x	Commentary without text. Thematic catalog entered as work of the composer, and index added as a dashed on entry with the work to which it belongs. Concordance and continuation in the form of an independent work with separate title are different works.
Prussian Inst. (1908)			x	Concordances, and continuations are different works. Indexes, repertories and the like are put under the title of the work to which they relate, unless the work has many editions, and the index does not belong to a particular one.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Vatican (1938)			x	Commentaries, scholia, concordances, and continuations, appendixes or supplements which are entirely separate and independent works are treated as different works. Other continuations, appendixes or supplements are entered under the same main entry word as the original work. Indexes to an individual work are entered with the work.
Bodleian 1939 1941 rules		x		Commentaries, concordances.
			x	Continuation in the form of an independent work with author and title differing from that of the original is diff. work. Sequels and concordances are different works. Dashed on entries used to enter a continuation or supplement not independent of the work to which it belongs (usually, but not necessarily, by the same author), or an index to a particular work with the work.
1949 rules CCR 1956	x		x	Same as 1941 rules. A work intended as an auxiliary, supplementary or subsidiary part of another work is entered under the author or title of the other work or is added on the entry of that work.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
CCR 1958			x	A work represented as a supplement to or as a part of another work, without a title of its own, is included in the entry of the other work, but if it has a distinct title, it is entered as a separate work.
CCR 1960			x	A work which continues, supplements or otherwise relates to another work is treated as the same work if it has the same author as the other work or if both are entered under title, and if it does not have an individual title; otherwise, different work.
CCR 1961			x	Same as above; an index to the text of a particular publication is entered with the text.
AACR1			x	Same work if title indistinctive and dependent and it falls into one of three categories: 1) auxiliary work the use of which is dependent on one particular edition of the main work; 2) supplement that is a continuation of the main work, except a supplement by a different author that takes the form of an independent work; 3) subseries or supplement of serial.
AACR2		x		
AACR2R		x		

Change in Title of Work

As can be seen below, a change in title can have the effect of causing two manifestations of the same work to be treated as two different works. In the first Table below, the rules referred to are those for uniform titles. For this Table, the operational definition used for "same work" and "different work" is different from that used in all the other tables above. For this Table, two items are considered to have been treated as different works if they are given main entries which differ in either author *or* title. In other words, in this Table, if two manifestations of the same work entered under author are not given a uniform title when a change in title has taken place, they are considered to have been treated as two different works. This approach was taken in the first Table because it was felt that it would more clearly illustrate the differences among the codes described.

The second Table demonstrates that with the advent of successive entry, there has been a tendency toward considering a change in serial title to constitute the creation of a new work.

CONDITION: Change in title of work

TYPE: Monographs

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Bodleian 1674			x	Editions of a work entered under author kept together regardless of change in title. Editions of anonymous works not kept together.
Panizzi			x	Editions of a work entered under author kept together regardless of change of title. Editions of work entered under title kept together only for Bible.
Jewett			x	Same as Panizzi, plus translations of works entered under title treated as same work as original.
Cutter 1			x	Same as Panizzi.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Cutter 2-4 LA 1883	x		x	Same as Panizzi, with addition of other sacred books to the Bible.
ALA 1889 Bodleian 1889 Linderfelt			x	Same as LA 1883.
			x	Same as Panizzi.
			x	Same work unless revised, in which case different work.
Dewey 1890			x	Different work unless it is a sacred work, or an anonymous classic.
			x	Same as Dewey.
ALA 1902			x	Same as Dewey.
ALA 1904 1908 rules			x	Same as Dewey. At LC, however, filing titles were used to keep translations entered under author with the originals.
			x	Same as Linderfelt.
Prussian Inst. (1908) Fellows (1922)			x	Optionally, same work if author is voluminous; also same work if sacred book or anonymous classic.
			x	Same as Fellows.
Vatican (1938) Bodleian 1939			x	Same work if entered under author, or if sacred book or any- mous classic.
1941 rules			x	Same as Dewey. At LC, however, filing titles were used to keep translations entered under author with the originals.
			x	Same as 1941 rules.
1949 rules				
CCR 1956	x			
CCR 1958	x			

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
CCR 1960	x			
CCR 1961			x	Optional, but if op- tion followed, all are same work.
AACR1			x	Optional. Even if option followed, not same work if revised.
AACR2R			x	Optional. Even if option followed, not same work if revised in the same language.
AACR2R			x	Same as AACR2.
CONDITION: Change in title of work				
TYPE: Serials				
CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Jewett	x			Latest entry.
Cutter 1-4			x	Earliest entry or successive entry; choice left to cata- logers. In the 4th ed., earliest entry is recom- mended when volume numbering continues through two or more sets.
				Successive entry.
Linderfelt		x		Successive entry.
Dewey 1890	x			Earliest entry.
ALA 1902	x			LC rule: latest entry.
ALA 1904 1908 rules	x		x	Same as 1902. Latest entry unless change of title is accompanied by new volume numbering, in which case, succes- sive entry.
Prussian Inst. (1908)			x	Earliest entry unless change of title is accompanied by new volume numbering, in which case, succes- sive entry.

*A merger of two or more titles always resulted in successive entries, even if the volume numbering continued that of one or all the previous titles. Splits of titles could be cataloged on a single latest entry record, provided they involved designated parts or sections like "1" and "2" or "A" and "B"; when that was not the case (a minority of titles), successive entry had to be used, even if the "new" publications showed the same frequency and perfectly parallel numbering systems.

CODE:	SAME WORK	DIFF. WORK	DECISION	CRITERIA
Fellows (1922)			x	Indicates all the above options without recommending one.
Vatican (1938)			x	Same as 1908 rules.
Bodleian 1939		x		Successive entry.
1941 rules			x	Same as 1908 rules.
1949 rules			x	Same as 1908 rules.
CCR 1956		x		Successive entry.
CCR 1958		x		Successive entry.
CCR 1961		x		Successive entry. Optionally, a serial which has ceased may be given latest entry.
ICCP	x			Successive entry.
AACR1	x			Successive entry.
AACR2	x			Successive entry.
AACR2R	x			Successive entry. Between AACR2 and AACR2R, rules for when the title has changed were revised to allow for more and more variation in the title to occur without change considered to have occurred.
KEY:				
Panizzi	Panizzi's 91 Rules. In: Brault, Nancy. <i>The Great Debate on Panizzi's Rules in 1847-1849</i> . Los Angeles: The School of Library Service and the University Library, 1972.			
Jewett	Jewett, Charles Coffin. "On the Construction of Catalogs." 2nd ed. 1853. In: <i>Charles Coffin Jewett and American Librarianship, 1841-1868</i> . Ed. by Michael H. Harris. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1975. 131-155.			
Cutter 1	Cutter, Charles A. "Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue." In: <i>Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition and Management: Special Report, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Part II</i> . Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1876. 3-89.			
Cutter 2	Cutter, Charles A. <i>Rules for a Dictionary Catalog</i> . 2nd ed. with corrections and additions. Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1889.			
Cutter 3	Cutter, Charles A. <i>Rules for a Dictionary Catalog</i> . 3rd ed. with corrections and additions and an alphabetical index. Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1891.			

Cutter 4	Cutter, Charles A. <i>Rules for a Dictionary Catalog</i> . 4th ed., rewritten. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1904.
LA 1883	Library Association of the United Kingdom. "Cataloguing Rules of the Library Association of the United Kingdom (as revised at Liverpool, 1883)." <i>Library Chronicle</i> 2(1885): 25-28.
Bodleian 1889	Appendix I in: Cutter, Charles A. <i>Rules for a Dictionary Catalog</i> . 2nd ed. with corrections and additions. Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1889.
ALA 1889	Appendix I in: Cutter, Charles A. <i>Rules for a Dictionary Catalog</i> . 2nd ed. with corrections and addition Special Report on Public Libraries (U.S. Bureau of Education) 2. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1889.
Wheatley Linderfelt	Wheatley, H.B. <i>How to catalogue a library</i> . London: Stock, 1889. Linderfelt, Klas August. <i>Eclectic Card Catalog Rules</i> . Boston: Charles A. Cutter, 1890.
Dewey 1890	Dewey, Melvil. <i>Library School Card Catalog Rules</i> . 3rd ed. rev. Boston: Library Bureau, 1890.
ALA 1902	American Library Association. Advisory Catalog Committee. <i>Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog</i> . Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1902.
ALA 1904	American Library Association. Advisory Catalog Committee. <i>Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog</i> . Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1904.
1908 rules	American Library Association. <i>Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries</i> . American ed. Boston, Mass.: American Library Association, Publishing Board, 1908.
Prussian Inst. (1908)	<i>The Prussian Instructions: Rules for the Alphabetical Catalogs of the Prussian Libraries</i> . Transl. from the 2nd ed. with an introd. and notes by Andrew D. Osborn. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1938.
Fellows (1922)	Fellows, Dorcas. <i>Cataloging Rules with Explanations and Illustrations</i> . 2nd ed., rev. and enl. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1922.
Vatican (1938)	Vatican Library. <i>Rules for the Catalog of Printed Books</i> . Transl. from the 2nd Italian ed. by Thomas J. Shanahan et al., ed., Wyllis E Wright. Chicago: American Library Association, 1948.
Bodleian 1939 1941 rules	Bodleian Library. <i>Cataloguing Rules</i> . Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1939. American Library Association. Catalog Code Revision Committee. <i>A.L.A. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries</i> . Prelim. American 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1941.
1949 rules	American Library Association. Division of Cataloging and Classification. <i>A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries</i> . 2nd ed. ed. by Clara Beetle. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949.
RDC, motion pictures, 1953	Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. <i>Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Motion Pictures and Filmstrips</i> . 2nd prelim. ed. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1953.
RDC, phono- records, 1964	Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. <i>Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Phonorecords</i> . 2nd prelim. ed. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1964.
RDC, pic- tures, 1959	Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. <i>Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Pictures, Designs and Other Two-dimensional Representations</i> . Prelim. ed. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1959.

- CCR 1956 Lubetzky, Seymour. *Code for Cataloging: Authors and Titles*. Rev. ed., partial draft. American Library Association, Code Revision Committee, Dec. 1956.
- CCR 1958 Lubetzky, Seymour. *Code of Cataloging Rules: Bibliographic Entry and Description: a Partial and Tentative Draft for a New Edition of Bibliographic Cataloging Rules Prepared for the Catalog Code Revision Committee*. Chicago: American Library Association, Catalog Code Revision Committee, June, 1958.
- CCR 1960 Lubetzky, Seymour. *Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry*. An unfinished draft. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960.
- CCR 1961 Lubetzky, Seymour. *Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry: Additions, Revisions and Changes Prepared in Light of Discussions of the March 1960 Draft for Consideration of the Catalog Code Revision Committee*. Chicago: American Library Association, Sept. 1961.
- AACR1 *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. North American text. Chicago: American Library Association, 1967.
- AACR1, Chap. 12 *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. North American text. Chapter 12. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.
- AACR2 *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1978.
- AACR2R *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. 2nd ed., 1988 Revision. Chicago: American Library Association, 1988.

SUMMARY

When most catalogs were book catalogs, the catalog editor could categorize and arrange the various editions of a work on a page in such a way they could be readily scanned, and the editor could do this without being dependent on the alphabet for the categorization and arrangement. The new technology represented by the card catalog was immediately embraced because it allowed continuous updating of the catalog and thus more timely inclusion of the most recent acquisitions, which, of course, were often those most in demand. However, in adopting this new technology and throwing out the old, a baby went out with the bath water—no longer could editions be arranged in the most scannable and useful order, regardless of alphabetic heading. In order to get a good scannable collocation, manipulation of alphabetic headings was necessary. The Library of Congress did this internally, but did not distribute its uniform titles, and the codes that contained uniform title rules always made them optional. Thus, in practice, most card catalogs did not create optimal collocations of the editions of multiple-edition works.

It can be seen from the above examination of Anglo-American

cataloging codes that the trend in Anglo-American cataloging practice has been away from the collocation of the editions of a work called for by the second objective. Whenever change in practice takes place, it leads to less collocation. AACR2, with its movement toward more title main entries, exacerbates this trend, since uniform title main entry to collocate editions of a work entered under title is an option in AACR2, and one that is little followed.

It is probable that one reason for this trend is the high cost of cataloging and the fear that choice of main entry in order to collocate editions uses precious cataloger time. As a working cataloger, I suspect that choice of main entry takes much less time than the authority work necessary to sort out two authors with the same name. The trend toward title main entry puts more of a burden on the title to bear the whole weight of identifying and distinguishing this work from others of the same title; when both author and title were used to identify the work and create a collocation point at the author main entry (or author-title main entry, depending on whether optional uniform titles were used), conflict was much less frequent. However, in any case, the larger our catalogs become, the weaker alphabet-dependent matching is as a tool to create collocation—in other words, the more likely conflicts are to occur.

We now are well into converting to a new technology for cataloging—the online catalog. We have been criticized for carrying old practices into this new technology without examining them. However, the usual old practice that is criticized is that of the display of a single record in card format; actually, the card format was a rather elegant display and much more readily scannable than the displays labelled with arcane bibliographic terms that are proposed to replace them,* not to mention the usual single record screen display

*For example, "Material:" "Description:" or "Collation:" in front of the physical description; while users know that books have pages and know terms like "videocassettes," they don't have common terms for areas of our descriptions; adding words with which they aren't familiar clutters up the display and probably confuses more than helps them. See the following for examples of labelled displays:

Walt Crawford, Lennie Stovel and Kathleen Bales, *Bibliographic Displays in the Online Catalog* (New York: Knowledge Industry Pubs., 1986).

Walt Crawford, *Patron Access: Issues for Online Catalogs* (Boston, MA: G.K. Hall, 1987).

that begins with information about the computer system that has nothing to do with the relationship of that record to others in the database. The old practice that might be fruitfully examined is the dependence on the alphabet for arrangement of records.

The current technology for collocation, carried over from card catalogs, has two major disadvantages. First, the fundamental alphabetical ordering, discussed above, demands the normalization of names of persons, corporate bodies and works, in order to organize records for editions of works into work units. Normalization is costly, in that it requires many hours of effort by highly trained staff.

Secondly, and of equal if not more importance, in order for the technique of displaying the work to the user at the main entry to succeed, the user has to be educated about the power of the main entry and trained to look there, even though he or she may have already found some information at other points in the catalog. For example, if the user seeking Guyton's *Basic human physiology* does a title search in the catalog, he or she will find the first and second editions only; only the educated user who notices that the main entry is Guyton, and then searches under author, will find the third edition, which now has the title *Human physiology and mechanisms of disease*.

It is possible that mechanical linking techniques that bypass the alphabetical matching of identical headings might enable us to do a better job of serving the user looking for a work represented by more than one record.¹ The HYPERCATalog Project described by Hjerpe may be moving in this direction.² One can envision a catalog that could tell a user looking at a particular record that a later edition, or an English translation, or the same serial work under another title is available, even though the user's search did not retrieve the later edition or the translation or all the issues of the serial work.³ One way to conceptualize collocation in the catalog of the future might be using the concept of co-occurrence rules for searching. Currently various keyword access systems assume that when a user's search includes more than one term, these terms should co-occur within a single record, or within a single heading. However, neither the MARC record (which represents a single edition of a work) nor the single heading (which usually represents

either the author or the title, but rarely both) corresponds to the particular work which is probably sought by most known-item searchers. In other words, the sets within which co-occurrence occurs in online systems probably do not correspond to the sets sought by users. One online solution might be to have the searching programs for known item searchers look for the co-occurrence of more than one keyword within the set of records comprising all editions of a work, and all authority records for its author or authors. Perhaps the job of the cataloger of the future will be to maintain the mechanical links that create such sets in a local online public access catalog, rather than to create the individual records in such a way that they will come together alphabetically, as is done now. One could envision the process of cataloging as involving the cataloger pointing to a particular author and work, so that a newly created record could be linked correctly to existing author and work nodes. Perhaps a program could even be devised to help the cataloger determine the commonest form of name of a prolific author, or even alert the cataloger when the commonest form of name has changed. (Of course, for display purposes, a single citation form will be required whenever the work needs to be displayed with other works so that the user can choose among them, as in a subject search.)

NOTES

1. Michael Gorman, "Authority Control in the Prospective Catalog," in *Authority Control: the Key to Tomorrow's Catalog: Proceedings of the 1979 Library and Information Technology Association Institutes* (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1982), 166-180.
 2. Michael Gorman, "Authority Files in a Developed Machine System," in *What's in a Name?* (Toronto: University of Toronto Library Automation System, 1978), 179-202.
 3. Michael Gorman, "Cataloging and the New Technologies," in *The Nature and Future of the Catalog*, Maurice J. Freedman and S. Michael Malinconico, eds. (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1979), 127-152.
 4. Michael Gorman, "Serial Control in a Developed Machine System," *The Serials Librarian* 5 (1980): 13-26.
 5. Sally McCallum, "MARC Record-Linking Technique," *Information Technology and Libraries* 1 (1982): 281-291.
2. R. Hjerpe, "Project HYPERCATalog: Visions and Preliminary Conceptions of an Extended and Enhanced Catalog," in *International Research Forum in*

Information Science (6th: 1985: Frascati, Italy), *Intelligent Information Systems for the Information Society* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1986).

3. Melissa M. Bernhardt, "Dealing with Serial Title Changes: Some Theoretical Considerations," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 9 (1988): 25-39.

Marjorie Flaspeter and Linda Lomker, "Earliest online . . ." *Serials Review* 11 (1985): 63-70.

Robert B. Harriman, Jr., "Coordination of Cataloging Practices in the United States Newspaper Program," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 6 (1986): 15-29.

for faculty/professionals with journal subscription recommendation authority for their institutional library . . .

If you have read a reprint or photocopy of this article, would you like to make sure that your library also subscribes to this journal? If you have the authority to recommend subscriptions to your library, we will send you a free sample copy for review with your librarian. Just fill out the form below—and make sure that you type or write out clearly both the name of the journal and your own name and address.



Yes, please send me a complimentary sample copy of this journal:

_____ (please write in complete journal title here—do not leave blank)

I will show this journal to our institutional or agency library for a possible subscription.

The name of my institutional/agency library is:

NAME: _____

INSTITUTION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

Return to: Sample Copy Department, The Haworth Press, Inc.,
10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 13904-1580

A Comparison of and French Catalog

Neil A. Jacobowitz

ABSTRACT. In light of the increasing foreign MARC records, this article explores the relation to AACR2R. After providing the rules and discussing their format, the article examines AACR2R in detail. All areas compared. The most significant ones are found in access points, for uniform titles, and for description.

INTRODUCTION

Proliferating access to the Internet is making electronic records increasingly available. The Council recently appointed the Foreign MARC Task Group to investigate various possibilities for use of foreign United States libraries. The Task Group established a MARC Coalition to provide a mechanism for cooperation related to the acquisition, analysis, conversion of foreign MARC records. In light of these developments, this article examines French cataloging rules and their relation to AACR2R.¹

This study has several aims. First, the reader will find the information helpful in interpreting bibliographic records and rules, given the likelihood of greater use of s

Neil A. Jacobowitz, BA, MA, MLS, is Catalog Librarian at City College of New York, New York, NY 10031.

Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 1, 1995
© 1995 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.