

II^e SECTION.15^e question.

AGREEMENT ON CATALOGUING RULES IN AMERICA

by J. C. M. HANSON

*Chief of Catalogue Division, Library of Congress,
Washington, D. C.*

I. — HISTORY.

Efforts to bring about uniformity in cataloguing rules among American librarians are comparatively recent. The first attempt important enough to attract general attention was a suggestion of Professor C. C. Jewett, librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, presented to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at its New Haven meeting, August 1850, to have a catalogue printed by stereotyping titles separately and preserving the blocks or plates in alphabetical order of the titles, so as to be able readily to insert additional titles in their proper places; the formation of a general catalogue of American libraries being the final object (1).

In a report by Professor Jewett, published in 1852 under the title « On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries, and of a General Catalogue; and their publication by means of Separate Stereotyped Titles. With Rules and Examples », he presents a code of rules, based upon those of the British Museum.

Some of Professor Jewett's variations from the British

(1) Cf. Jahr & Strohm, *Bibliography of Cooperative Cataloguing*, pp. 6-7, 14-15.

Museum rules tend to conform to certain views held by Panizzi, but not finally sanctioned by the Trustees of the Museum, as for instance, his proposal to enter anonymous books under the first word of the title, not an article or preposition.

In 1853, Jewett read a paper before the first conference of American Librarians held in New York, where he again voices his recommendations for a general system of cataloguing. The convention adopted resolutions of recommendation, but as no other general meeting of librarians was held before 1876, the matter was dropped.

In 1876, a second meeting of American librarians was called at Philadelphia, and here, various papers were read, which directly or indirectly touched on the problem of cooperative cataloguing (1). Later in the year, a code of rules was reported (2).

More important in its results perhaps, was the publication of the first edition of Cutter's « Rules for a dictionary catalog » which appeared as Part 2 of the report of the Bureau of Education, on Public Libraries in the United States, Washington, 1876. While Cutter's rules were necessarily based to a large extent on the British Museum code and the revision of the same prepared by Jewett, there is no doubt that his compilation has exercised greater influence on American cataloguing practice than the work of his predecessors.

A committee on uniform title entries was appointed Sept. 5, 1877 (3). This committee made a full report on March 1, 1878 (4). The report was signed by C. A. Cutter, A. R. Spofford, S. S. Green, J. M. Dyer, L. E. Jones.

The rules thus prepared were again made use of by a committee of the Library Association of the United Kingdom, which at the Manchester meeting of 1879, reported a code based on the A. L. A. rules (5). This action on the part of the British Association may have suggested a motion presented by M. Cutter at the Cincinnati meeting of the

(1) *Library Journal* V. 1, passim.

(2) *Library Journal* V. 1, pp. 170-175.

(3) *Library Journal* V. 2, p. 30.

(4) *Library Journal* V. 3, pp. 13-19.

(5) *Library Journal* V. 4, pp. 416-417.

American Library Association in 1882, that the A. L. A. rules be referred back to the Cooperative committee with power to make needed changes so as to bring them into uniformity, so far as should appear desirable, with those of the L. A. U. K (1).

At the Buffalo conference of 1882, a full report was submitted by M. Cutter in which he states: « Your committee, as directed at the Cincinnati meeting, have carefully compared our cataloging rules with those of the Library Association of the United Kingdom, and also, though not ordered to, with the « Compendious rules » issued by M. E. B. Nicholson, Bodley's librarian. They find that the three sets of rules are substantially the same. There are, however, seven cases in which the English Association differs from us, in which, in our opinion, we must continue to differ, and three cases in which we think the American rule should be altered to coincide with the English».

The principal instances of non-concurrence are a stricter adherence to entry of pseudonymous books under the real name instead of under the pseudonym than was at the time favored by the British Association, and the entry of an anonymous book under the first word in place of entry under the chief subject-word. The American committee also objected to the introduction into the author catalogue of certain form and subject entries.

In 1883, the Cooperative committee submitted its « Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog (2) ». They were exceedingly brief and perhaps for that reason failed of general adoption, the code followed by the majority of libraries, even after 1883, being that of Cutter (3).

At the Chicago conference of 1893, M. Lane presented a

(1) Library Journal V. 7, pp. 205-206.

(2) Library Journal V. 8, pp. 251-254, also Cutter's Rules for a dictionary catalogue, 3d ed. app. I.

(3) M. Lane's statement before the World's Library Conference of 1893, in Chicago. *Papers prepared for the World's Library Congress*, 1893. p. 841.

The eclectic card catalogue rules of Linderfelt, published in 1890, and the Library School Rules published in 1889, have also had a number of adherents.

careful résumé of the entire cataloguing question, which showed, that in spite of all efforts of the Cooperative committee there was still considerable disagreement on rules and practice. His report, together with the International Conference of 1897 at London, the reorganization of the Library of Congress, and the general dissatisfaction with the limited scope of the cooperative work so far undertaken by the Association, had, no doubt, much to do with the prominence given to the question of cooperation at the Montreal Conference of 1900.

The negotiations between the A. L. A. and the Library of Congress, which were a direct outcome of that meeting, led to an agreement whereby the latter institution undertook to make the catalogue cards printed for its own books, available also for the use of other libraries (1).

The subsequent development of the cooperative cataloguing movement in America down to 1904 has been fully set forth in the preface to the A. L. A. rules Advance edition, issued by the Library of Congress in 1902.

In 1904, the A. L. A. received from the British Library Association a proposal looking to the preparation of a joint code of rules. The invitation was accepted, and as an outcome of the subsequent negotiations a joint code was published in 1908 (2).

II. — PRESENT STATUS OF THE RULES QUESTION IN AMERICA. POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN CODE AND THOSE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

In the preceding section we have seen how the American Library Association came to adopt a common code of rules.

(1) The Anglo-American Agreement on Cataloging Rules and its Bearing on International Cooperation in Cataloging of Books. (Conférence Internationale de Bibliographie et de Documentation — Bruxelles, 9-10 Juillet 1908).

(2) Catalog Rules — Author and Title Entries — Compiled by committees of the American Library Association and the (British) Library Association — Published in Boston, Mass., and London, England, 1908. (For history, cf. preface).

That this code was accepted also by the Library of Congress, has, perhaps, more than anything else, served to give the agreement an immediate practical value.

The catalogue cards printed by the latter institution are now distributed to some 1350 other libraries. The subscribers find that the cards prove most economical when they can be inserted into the catalogues with little or no modification. Here is a direct inducement, therefore to adhere to the rules which govern in the compilation of the entries at the Library of Congress.

As previously stated the Anglo-American code was issued in 1908 in two editions, the American edition printed in Boston and the English edition printed in London. The variations between the two are comparatively few, there being different readings for only eight out of 174 rules. The differences have to do mainly with the question of heading under which it is thought that users of the catalogues are most likely to look for certain information.

The A. L. A. committee was guided in its decisions by a desire to meet the « public's habitual way of looking at things » (1), even though in so doing strict consistency in the rules and their application might at times have to be sacrificed.

The rules on which the committees failed to reach full agreement are : Nos. 16, 32, 33, 40, 41, 116, 118 and 121. The fact that, in America, the card catalogue has practically supplanted the printed catalogue, while in Great Britain the latter is still in a large measure adhered to, no doubt accounts for some of the differences. In a card catalogue changes of headings are carried out more readily than in the printed catalogue, where it is desirable that supplements shall retain the headings once decided upon for the original or main catalogue.

M. Minto has brought out this point very clearly in an able article, published in the *Library Association Record* for July, 1909. He shows how in Rules 16, 32, 33, 40 and 41, the

(1) Preface to American edition, p. IX.

American committee has attempted to formulate rules that would clash as little as possible with the « public's habitual way of looking at things ».

In the rules referred to, the American committee had indeed considered that a reader would be best served by finding:

a) Concordances, under the compiler, rather than under the author concordanced (rule 16).

b) Certain princes best known under their family names, under the latter rather than their fore-names (rule 32).

c) Noblemen under their titles, rather than their family names (rule 33).

d) Authors who have changed their name under the latest form of name (rule 40).

e) Married women, under the latest name (rule 41).

Exceptions to be allowed where some other form of name was decidedly better known, also references or added entries according to the requirements of the case.

On all of these points the British committee held to a uniform consistent rule, without exceptions, as follows :

16) Concordances under the author concordanced.

32) Members of the immediate families of sovereigns under their fore-names.

33) Noblemen under the family name.

40) Authors who change their names, under the original name.

41) Married women under the earliest name used as authors.

It is obvious that the British librarians have the best of the argument as viewed from the stand-point of consistency and the uniform application of a definite principle. The « decidedly best known » as M. Minto points out, offers a somewhat precarious foundation on which to base decisions in cataloguing. He observes : « The question will arise — better known to whom ? to the cataloguer ? to the specialist ? to the ordinary intelligent reader ? or « the man in the street » ? ».

That concessions will be made by one side or the other,

on one or more of the above rules, there can be little doubt. The question is, which tendency is to prevail, the American, which aims at a compromise between the scholarly and the popular library, in endeavouring to provide a form of heading likely to prove convenient to the public while sacrificing in a measure the consistent and scientific principle of the rule, or the British view, which holds to a consistent principle as the safest and, in the end, the most economical solution, even though it clash at times with the convenience of the public.

A way out of the difficulty has been suggested (1), viz: The drawing up of two codes, one for the scholarly library of scientific character, the other for the small public library, whose constituency may be better served by a catalogue which aims to provide the form of heading most familiar to the majority of readers.

The difficulty with the proposed remedy is that no cooperative agency has so far been able to solve the problem of supplying two sets of entries, one for the scholarly, another for the popular library. The Library of Congress has made great sacrifices in its form of entry, in order, if possible, to strike a compromise between the demands of the two classes. It has been successful only in part.

In a discussion of a possible extension of the existing international agreement, it will be well to bear in mind, that the demands of the reference and the circulating library do not always agree. Is legislation to aim at a compromise, or shall efforts be made to provide two sets of rules?

A further difficulty to be reckoned with in any effort to extend the present scope of the agreement, is the fact that it must embrace nations whose languages, literatures and library traditions have little in common. Problems will therefor arise somewhat more difficult of solution than those which confronted the committees of the British and American Library Associations.

In order to bring out some of these difficulties and also to give a general idea of existing points of agreement, it may

(1) Catalogue rules, 1908. American edition, pref. p. VII.

be in place to institute a brief comparison between the Prussian « Instruktionen » and the Anglo-American rules.

These codes are selected for the reason that each presumably represents the cataloguing practice of as large a number of libraries as any system of rules now before the public, and also because they will serve to exhibit certain radical differences affecting important classes of publications.

The second edition of the « Instruktionen », Berlin, 1909, is followed and for the purposes of the comparison it will be sufficient to include only Section II, § 30-180. «(Instruktionen für die Ordnung der Titel) », questions of arrangement and classification being omitted. (1)

Fundamental rules, (Grundregeln) 30-35 agree in the main with *AA*, the exception being that § 32 brings up one of the essential points of difference between the German and the Anglo-American systems, viz: the question of corporate entry. The Prussian rules do not recognize societies, institutions and similar bodies as authors, but enter their publications under the title. In the Anglo-American code, on the other hand, a large section, 58-111, is devoted to this class of authors.

Chrestomathies, etc., Literary remains and Collections of letters, Collections of proverbs, legends etc., Laws, 36-40, agree with the corresponding rules of *AA*, except that *I* follows the American variant in entry of concordances, and fails to recognize a country or society as author of its laws and regulations.

Inscriptions, 41, agrees in the main with *AA* 126. 1, 129. *Texts*, 42 (cf. *AA* 13, Commentaries, and 19, Revisions) A stronger tendency is noted in the *AA* rules towards entry under original author or text.

Translations, 43. According to *AA* 21 all translations are entered under the original author, with added entry under the translator. *I* provides for exceptions in case of translations like *Ulfilas*, *Gothic Bible*, *King Alfred's Orosius* and

(1) References will be abbreviated as follows: *I* = Instruktionen. *AA* = Anglo-American rules.

Chaucer's translation of Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*.

Revisions, 44-45 same as *AA* 19.

Continuations, 46 same as *AA* 14.

Indexes, 47 agree with *AA* 15.

Illustrations, engravings, music, 48-50 agree in the main with *AA* 4-8. Certain exceptions permitted by the latter, not provided for in *I*.

Librettos, 51. *I* enters under composer, *AA* under librettist if known with added entry under composer.

Dissertations, 52-55 same as *AA* 4.

« *Festschriften* », 56. *AA* 126.2 recognizes societies and institutions as authors of « *Festschriften* » published by them. According to *I* these are entered under title.

Biographical and personal publications (anonymous) 57. According to *I* under name of subject, according to *AA* 112-118 under first word of title (Subject entry being otherwise provided for.)

Official publications, 58. *I* enters under originator (Urheber) *AA* under country, church, body, etc. e. g. Roman Catholic Church. *Pope*, 1402-1503 (Alexandre VI); Great Britain, *Statutes*, 1837-1901 (Victoria).

Catalogues of private collections, 59. *AA* 89. Both under owner of collection. *AA* makes added, not main entry, under author.

Sales catalogues, 60, *AA* 109. Both under firm. If catalogue of a private collection, under owner (cf. *I* 59, *AA* 89.)

Serial publications (Annuals) 61, *AA* 123. Both under title.

Periodicals, collections and series, 62-66, *AA* 121-128. Both under title, but *AA* advises entry of definite collections of single works under editor or compiler.

Joint authors, 67, *AA* 2. Same.

Correspondence, 68, *AA* 2. Same.

Anonymous publications, 69-77, *AA* 112-120. General agreement except that titles are treated differently (see III infra.)

Author entry, 78-80, *AA* 1, 23, (also definitions). General agreement.

Classical authors, 81-87, *AA* 49, 51. Same.

Byzantine authors, 88-90, *AA* 50. Same.

Medieval authors, 91-106, *AA* 27, 31-32, 34-37, 43-48. In agreement on all essential points.

Modern names. Surnames with prefix, 108-114, *AA* 26. Same, except that *I* goes a little farther than *AA* in entering names with prefixes consisting of both preposition and article under the prefix, rather than the name following.

Compound names, 115-124, *AA* 25. No material difference.

Change of name, 127-131, *AA* 40, 42. General agreement, except that the British variant of 40 would enter under original name under which the author has published books.

Arrangement of name, 132. Same.

Unused forenames, etc., 133-137, *AA* 27-29. Same.

Compound forenames, 138, *AA* 27. Same.

Forenames with variants, 140, *AA* 29. Same.

Pseudonyms, 141, *AA* 38. Same.

Firms, 142-145, *AA* 109. Practically the same.

Oriental names, 146-160, *AA* 52-56. No material difference.

Case, 161. No special rule devoted to this in *AA*, but agrees with *I* in practice.

Various forms of name, 162. The principle followed in several *AA* rules practically the same as that laid down in 162.

Variations due to transliteration, 163-163, *AA* 42. The latter prefers a form of transliteration differing from that prescribed in its App. 2, provided the author has himself consistently used such form. *I* advises the form set down in its transliteration rules (Anlage II).

Different names for same author, 165-168, *AA* 33, 41, 43. Same. *I* agrees with American variant for entry of noblemen (35) and married women (41).

Real name or pseudonym, 169-170, *AA* 38. Agreement on the main rule, but *I* provides also for a number of exceptions, as Mark Twain, Pierre Loti (cf. Library of Congress practice in foot note to *AA* 38).

Arrangement, 171-180. Omitted in *AA*. The principles laid down in *I* 171-180 are followed in the main by American and British libraries.

Arrangement (Continued) 181-241. These rules are only incidentally brought out in the *AA* code. The principle of corporate entry and of entry of title under first word not an article, followed by *AA*, accounts for the chief points of disagreement.

In § 210, Different spelling, *I* agrees with the British variant of *AA* 116.

In § 221-224, *I* agrees again with the British variant of *AA* 118, entry of anonymous translations.

In § 224, the individual books of the Bible are placed under their titles in the form which they bear in the Vulgate. *AA* 119 collects them all under Bible, with references from special titles.

III. — SUMMARY

The above comparison shows that there is at any rate room for concession.

As viewed from the American standpoint it must be granted that several of the British and German variants contain suggestions which might with profit be incorporated into the American rules. Similarly, our British and German colleagues may note American variants which they may be in a position to accept. There are accordingly grounds for believing that efforts towards further coordination will not prove altogether fruitless.

No doubt the crux of the entire discussion will be met with in corporate entry and the choice of entry-word for anonymous works, collections, serials and similar publications to be entered under their titles.

That British and American librarians will give up the principle of entry under societies, institutions and countries as authors seem unlikely. That they should, on the other hand, be willing to make changes in the present rules seems reasonable. It is a well known fact that Section C of the Anglo-American rules, Corporate bodies as authors, was framed with special reference to the needs of British and American librarians, particularly the latter (cf. *Library Journal*, Feb. 1905, Rules for corporate entry).

In this article the international phase of the cataloguing question was touched on as follows : « While the English and American library associations may eventually agree on a set of rules to include a series of well-defined exceptions, a wider agreement would in all likelihood result in one of two general rules, viz., entry under name, or entry under place. One exception might receive favorable consideration : the rule to enter government departments or bureaus under the name of the country. Of the two general rules, the second would have a great initial advantage in the precedents established by the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Swedish, Italian, and other European libraries, and by many American and English libraries which enter institutions and local societies under the name of the place. »

The above quotation may serve to fore-shadow the possible trend of concessions on this point. As for choice of entry word, in case of works entered under their titles, although the British Museum Catalog agrees approximately with the practice outlined in the « Instruktionen », the rule to enter under the first word not an article has nevertheless, been so firmly established both in American and British libraries, and has besides the support of such eminent authorities also in other countries, that it seems less probable that material concessions will be made here.

In conclusion it may be stated that the problems connected with the question under consideration are of such a nature that it is doubtful if much progress toward a definite agreement can be hoped for through general discussion in open conference. It would seem preferable that the question be referred to a committee representing the various nations interested, with instructions to investigate its difficulties, the chances of successful cooperation and the benefits likely to result therefrom. If the results of the preliminary investigation should seem to warrant it, the committee might be instructed to continue its work in the direction of devising ways and means for perfecting an international code of rules.