

---

## UNIT 2 HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY CATALOGUE CODES

---

### Structure

- 2.0 Objective
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Evolution of Catalogue
  - 2.2.1 Early stage (250 B.C. – 800 A.D.)
  - 2.2.2 Age of Inventory (1200 A.D. – 1800 A.D.)
  - 2.2.3 Age of finding list (1600 A.D. - 1800 A.D.)
  - 2.2.4 Modern Catalogue (1900 A.D.)
- 2.3 History of Catalogue Codes
  - 2.3.1 British Museum Cataloguing Rules
  - 2.3.2 Jewett's Rules
  - 2.3.3 Cutter's Rules
  - 2.3.4 AA Code of 1908
  - 2.3.5 Prussian Instructions
  - 2.3.6 Vatican Rules
  - 2.3.7 Classified Catalogue Code
  - 2.3.8 ALA Rules (Pre] 2nd ed)
  - 2.3.9 LC Descriptive Rules
- 2.4 Summary
- 2.5 Answers to Self Check Exercises
- 2.6 Key Words
- 2.7 References and Further Reading

---

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

---

Cataloguing, precisely stated, is the process of preparing descriptive records for the documents contained in a library collection. The purpose is to facilitate, communication and retrieval of information (bibliographic data or facts) about the documents. The process, as you know, applies a general system that is international in nature and scope. It is, thus, a standard practice based on rules empirically developed, i.e., through practice and reasoning. In the early stages, cataloguing was a local and individual library practice. It lacked a system. It developed into a logical system by stages from its primitive beginnings. How this development occurred? What vicissitudes did it pass through to reach the present stage of perfection? What factors, ideas and professional efforts contributed to the growth? These and many other issues constitute the matter of this Unit.

After reading this Unit you will be able to:

- clarify the concepts of history, development and evolutionary process of catalogue;
- state what, ideally is or should be a cataloguing code;
- identify the stages of development of catalogue;
- provide a brief account of development of catalogue codes;
- identify major contributions to cataloguing thought;
- state the salient features of some of the important codes;
- summarise the laws, canons and principles that govern the rules in the code(s);and
- anticipate the future developments.



---

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

---

A library catalogue code, one or two of which (for, there are a score of the them), as you may have surely become familiar with to some extent, can be explained as a 'set of rules' for guidance of cataloguers in the preparation of descriptive bibliographical records (i.e., entries in library catalogues, bibliographies and similar other lists) for books and other graphic materials so as to ensure consistency and uniformity in their treatment.

The code may additionally have rules for subject cataloguing/indexing and filing of entries as well. Generally, codes comprise rules for description of materials (books, etc.) and choice of headings and their forms needed in making author, title, etc. bibliographical entries including cross references as may be warranted. This is normally so with codes designed for author-title alphabetical catalogues in which subject entries with appropriate cross references serving as syndetic devices are also filed as in the dictionary catalogue. AACR 2, 1988 rev, the latest of the Anglo-American family of catalogue codes is one such example.

Subject cataloguing/indexing calls for a different skill and requires additionally the use of separate aids such as a list of subject headings (e.g., Sears List of Subject Headings) or a scheme of classification (e.g., Dewey Decimal Classification, Colon Classification, etc.). Similarly, filing of entries in the catalogue also needs a separate set of rules, as for example, ALA Rules for Filing Catalogue Cards, Library of Congress Filing Rules, etc.

Assigning call numbers to documents to facilitate shelving/storing and thus, to ensure physical control of documents, further requires the use of a classification scheme and any author or chronological tables as well (e.g., Cutter Author Marks, Biscoe Time Numbers, etc).

The comprehensive codes such as Cutter's Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue, Ranganathan's Classified Catalogue Code do not support the total cataloging process. Some classification schemes and any author/chronological table have to be employed as adjuncts.

This Unit is about the 'history' and 'development' of 'library catalogue codes' (which have greatly proliferated over the time). What do these terms, viz., history and development mean? Obviously, this is an important question to, which we have to initially turn and seek answer so as to understand the theme and scope of the Unit.

### Constraints

This unit calls for a comprehensive and thorough treatment to cover the various aspects of history and development of library catalogue codes. However, such a thorough treatment is not easy to attempt. There are constraints and limitations. The seemingly simple rules in the catalogue codes, in reality, are not simple. They have been formulated empirically. In the early stages and for quite long time, cataloguing activities in libraries were not aided by any rules. Catalogues were compiled for individual libraries applying the ingenuity and common sense possessed by their compilers. When the collections grew and became formidable, some guidelines became necessary so that the work by the successive generations of cataloguers would conform with that of their predecessors. The emergence of the printed catalogue in the 17th century established the need for rules so as to ensure consistency in continuation and updation, cumulation or revision of the catalogue. Thus, rules for the compilation of (printed) catalogues were drawn, based on past experiences. The idea of cooperation in cataloguing promoted from the beginning of the 19th century sought uniformity as an additional virtue. One time cataloguing to eliminate wasteful duplication of cataloguing efforts in the individual libraries became an ideal. The questions of what rules to be made and on what basis should they be made became the concern. Answers were sought in the conventional wisdom, through theoretical postulation of principles, and by formulation of objectives and functions in tune with changes and developments taking place in the bibliographic world.

The rules, which came up largely through the empirical path and progressed on the route to universalisation and internationalisation have an intellectual content and a unity of thought as well. What is appropriate, therefore, in the study of their history and development is elicitation of the intellectual content, clarification of the cataloguing concerns of different periods, and appreciation of the problems faced and the solutions found, the gradual maturation and crystallization of ideas obtained as also the logical principles and postulates underlying the codifications of rules. Mere chronological accounting of the history and chronology of the codes is not of great help.



The fact that the history of cataloguing rules has yet to be systematically written is true to a great extent. Barring a few historical accounts here and there of catalogues and cataloguing, comprehensive, cohesive and thoroughly written accounts of the history and development of library catalogue codes do not exist. For instance the history of catalogues in India and many other parts of the world is yet to be attempted. This lacuna is a major constraint. Even for the limited purpose of this unit any attempt at presenting a critical summary and piecing together of the essential parts is rendered difficult. Space is another constraint. It cannot also be treated in great elaboration disregarding the proportion in relation to other units.

### Self Check Exercise

1) Define a library catalogue code.

**Note** (1) Write your answer in the space given below.

(2) Check your answer with the answers given at the end of this unit.

.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 2.2 EVOLUTION OF CATALOGUE

---

The custodial responsibility assumed by the libraries of the early stages obligated on them the functions of acquisition and conservation entailing also the use of some system of bibliographic control so that the items on the store could be located and retrieved.

### 2.2.1 Early Stage (250 B.C. - 800 A.D.)

Some such methods though primitive, existed almost until the time the manuscripts came to end and ceased to be the primary vehicles of communication. The discovery of Assyro-Babylonian clay tablets, the wall inscriptions at Edfu and the extant remnants of the papyrus rolls of the Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilizations testify this fact. The catalogues and the materials they listed, both were in primal forms (clay tablets, inscriptions and papyrus rolls). From the archaeological finds of the Assyro-Babylonian clay tablets (1668-626 B.C.), the antiquity of the library catalogue can be easily placed around 2000 B.C. These tablets were similar to press guides with bibliographic data, such as title (occasionally, with opening words), number of tablets constituting a work, number of lines on a tablet, distinct subdivisions and location marks inscribed on them. They served as simple location devices. However, all such primal forms were not verily catalogues.

This system with no change continued to exist well into the first seven centuries of the Christian era. The fall of the Roman empire in the 6th century brought about a deliberate destruction and dispersal of the hitherto great collections of the private, public and temple libraries. The emergence of Christianity as the state religion in the 3rd century having already dealt a severe blow, the temple libraries began to disintegrate. Their place was now taken by the monastic libraries. As the major instruments of education in the middle ages (300 AD - 1100 AD) monasteries served the cause by collecting, producing and preserving the books useful in the learning by the clerics. The famous work, institutions of Cassiodorus (6th Century) was intended to serve as a scholarly model with an annotated guide to what was valuable reading of the times. The need of catalogue was not felt. Efforts were made later in compiling inventories. A list of books given by Gregory the Great in the 8th century AD to the church of St. Clements (Rome) was the earliest of the monastic library catalogues. It was a marble tablet with an introduction or prayer and a few biblical works inscribed on it. The catalogue of the monastic library of York composed by Alcuin in verse, which could be either a list of famous authors or a bibliography was the next. A third example is De Trinitate of St. Augustine, which too was a simple list of works transcribed on the flyleaf of a work.

### 2.2.2 Age of Inventory (1200 A.D. -1500 A.D.)

Such simple lists were attempted in good numbers in the succeeding periods (900 A.D. - 1100 A.D.). Louis Pious (814-840 A.D.) issued a decree requiring the monasteries and cathedrals to



list all the books in their possession. So the catalogues of the monasteries and cathedrals were compiled to serve the need for inventories of the material possession. Books were arranged not by author but by the importance of the work in the order of Bible, other religious works and secular works. Contents were not indicated in the case of collections (works of the same author and works of various authors on the same subject hound together, as was the practice). The old traditions of the pre-Christian era continued.

### 2.2.3 Age of Finding List (1600 A.D. - 1800 A.D.)

Although the inventory idea persisted, many catalogues of the 16th century such as the Catalogue of St. Martin's Priory of Dover, the Syon Catalogue, the Catalogue of the Bretton Monastery, etc. contained many additional details such as content notes, names of editors, translators, etc. in the entry and provided with author and other indexes. The 16th century proved a further productive period influenced by great bibliographers like Gesner, Treflerus, Maunsell, to mention a few. Of particular significance was the contribution made by Andrew Maunsell, a bookseller and a bibliographer in his own right, who published a bibliography of books in English. He adopted dictionary arrangement making entries under the surnames of authors with added entries provided under editors, subject words, etc. in a limited way. Through his procedure the concept of main entry (to be distinguished from the added entries as the one made under author with full bibliographic description) emerged. The idea of uniform heading also owes to him. He entered the Bible and books of the Bible under the uniform heading of Bible.

By the close of the century, although the vestiges of the inventory catalogue still existed, the need for uniformity and systematic approach to catalogue was clearly recognised. Full description became evident. Author entry gained importance as the primary entry providing the basic approach. Added entries were sought for additional approaches. Printed catalogue became the fashion. Efforts at standardization received new inspiration from men like Naude, Dury, Brillet and others.

The Bodleian catalogues produced during the century marked a milestone and greatly influenced the succeeding studies of cataloguing practice. Initially intended as shelf guides on single printed pages with supplements to follow, a catalogue (in book form) of printed books and manuscripts of the Bodleian library (in the typical manner of the 16th century shelf list) was printed in 1605. Thomas Bodley and Thomas James were the principal men behind it. The last of the Bodleian catalogue issued under the guidance of Thomas Hyde in 1674 marked further improvement. It continued the alphabetical order and other procedures as in the earlier catalogues but provided better assemblage of literary units. The preface contained rules which remained authoritative until the middle of the 19th century.

The next century i.e., 18th century was rather a period of stabilisation than innovation or solution. Libraries, more importantly the university and private collections grew in size without definite improvements in organisation. The spread of ideas was slow. Only the printed catalogues did serve the purpose but in a limited way; as examples. But most of them were influenced by the early bibliographers who were immature and were not concerned with logic or theory.

### 2.2.4 Modern Catalogue (1900 A.D.)

The 19th century was an age of great many codes: Catalogue was considered a finding list with the Bodleian concept of literary unit occasionally given expression in compilations. There ensued a spate of debates on the relative merits of author, dictionary, classed and alphabetioclassed catalogues. Author (under surname) and title (for anonymous work) entries constituted the author catalogue. From this author catalogue did develop the dictionary catalogue. It consisted of duplicate entries under authors, titles, subjects and forms. For example, the catalogue of the printed books of the Society of Antiquaries of London (1816), supposed as the first true dictionary catalogue, employed duplicate entry approach in one single alphabetical file. Classed catalogue was limited to subject arrangement in systematic order by grouping related subjects together or in proximity. As the purpose of the catalogue became better clarified, the classed catalogue gained importance. It applied the systems of classification schemes devised by Bacon, Horne, Brunet and others. The alphabetico-classed catalogue too became popular during the middle of the century. It was rather an amalgam of dictionary and classed catalogue. The first half of the century was, thus, characterised by a variety of combinations of arrangements and indexes, broadly divisible into two categories. The first category constituted



lists arranged in subject or classed order, i.e., broad subjects or classes in shelf list order with works subarranged according to accession and chronologically by imprint date, title or author. The second category consisted of alphabetically arranged indexes to classified file which was not a systematic one.

The supplementary alphabetical subject indexes created the need for standard lists of subject headings as aids. Since the practice of picking up subject words from the title lacked uniformity and made syndetic structure difficult, adoption of a better system specially needed for construction of dictionary catalogue was felt. This initiated efforts towards development of standard lists of subject heading. The ALA published such a list entitled, List of Subject Headings for use in the dictionary catalogue in 1895. It was considered as a standard list suitable for all types of libraries and found wide acceptance. The third and final edition was brought in 1911 when the Library of Congress List of Subject Headings (issued in 3 parts between 1909 and 1913) replaced it. Besides these two, three other publications viz., Poole's Index to Periodicals Literature, the ALA Index (an index for collections and composite works), and the Catalogue of the ALA Library (intended to serve as selection tool, cataloguing guide and printed catalogue), all published in 1893 (which still continue under different names and publishers) proved as useful bibliographical tools and influenced cataloguing. However, the idea of specific subject entry was still in the process of making with insistence on the use of standard terms in titles to indicate the subjects. The introduction of printed catalogue card service in 1901 by the Library of Congress was yet another development.

**Self Check Exercise**

2) How do inventory, finding list and catalogue differ from each other?

**Note:** i) Write your answer in the space given below.

ii) Check your answer with the answers given at the end of this Unit.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 2.3 HISTORY OF CATALOGUE CODES

---

The 19th century marks the beginning of code making. Since it is not easy to make a complete survey, we will introduce you to a select number of codes that belong to the Anglo-American family of codes. Additionally, we will also examine three other codes, viz., a German Code (Prussian Instructions), an Italian code (Vatican Rules) and Ranganathan's Classified Catalogue Code.

### 2.3.1 British Museum Cataloguing Rules

British Museum, Department of Printed Books. Rules for compiling books, maps and music in the British Museum. - Rev. ed. - London: British Museum, 1936. printed by order of the Trustees.

In 1757, the Royal Library (merged earlier in 1753 with Cottonian, Harleian and Sloan Collections) was transferred to the British Museum. The library's total stock of books at this time touched 5,00,000 mark. Since the previously compiled catalogues of the British Museum (Librorum Impressorum qui in Museo Britanico Ad servantur Catalogus, compiled by P.M. Many, S. Harper and S. Ayserough, published in 1787) and the other collections were poorly planned and not well executed lists, the trustees wanted to have a fresh alphabetical catalogue along with an additional general classed catalogue compiled. Accordingly, between 1813 and 1819 seven volumes of alphabetical catalogue (update of 1787 Librorum) were issued. Sir Henry H. Baber was the keeper of printed books at this time. The general classed catalogue had to be planned and executed. Thomas H. Horne made a convincing presentation of a scientific classification in his Outline for the Classification of the Library (submitted to the trustees in 1825). He was therefore engaged, for a time, to accomplish the task. The project,



however, failed and it was suspended in 1834. But his ideas on classification and rules for bibliographic description, especially, as they related to content notes, forms of authors' names and indexes for classified catalogue proved valuable addition to the literature on cataloguing. Baber, as the keeper proposed a general alphabetical author catalogue and suggested that Panizzi be entrusted with the task of editing-it. He formulated sixteen rules for guidance and suggested the use of uniform slips for entries so that their arrangement and preparation of the manuscript for printing would prove easy. Baber's rules required entry under author if it appeared either on the title page or elsewhere within the book, the form of the name taken on the same basis. Anonymous works were to be entered under the prominent or the first word (not an article or preposition) of the title with possible author's name added after the title within brackets. Pseudonymous works, similarly required entry under the pseudonym with real name added at the end of the title within brackets. Collections were to be entered under editor and translations under original author.

The current emphasis on scientific classification with Home's advocacy of classified catalogue on one hand, and the adherence to the tradition with Baber's insistence on alphabetical catalogue supported also by Panizzi on the other, ensued a spate of debates and arguments, of course, with no decisive results.

Baber's proposal for a new alphabetical catalogue was finally approved by the trustees in 1838 with the stipulation that it should be completed by 1840 and, instead in the shelf by shelf order (as was originally suggested by Baber and Panizzi), the catalogue was to be completely alphabetized and issued in separate volumes for each letter of the alphabet. Panizzi was directed to write the rules for its compilation.

Thus, came the famed British Museum Cataloguing Rules known also as Panizzi's 91 Rules. In fact, Panizzi did not author the rules all alone and entirely by himself. The code was the result of collaboration involving the concerted efforts of Edward Edwards, J.W. Jones, J.H. Parry and Thomas Watts besides Sir Anthony Panizzi. Each one first compiled a code individually which were then collectively studied and criticised to formulate rules by consensus so as to reflect the best in the cataloguing philosophy of the time. Initially 79 rules were formulated which were expanded to 91 rules in the final code published in 1841.

These rules, clearly, were written to provide for the catalogue of one larger library, the British Museum. They were not intended to be of general use, i.e., use in other libraries. Because both the compilation of the catalogue and the formulation of the rules proceeded side by side, the first volume of the catalogue issued in 1841 proved unsatisfactory, marred by many omissions. Obviously, the rules were applied partially. A rash of criticisms and enquiries followed requiring Panizzi to defend the rules. He questioned the feasibility of the project of a printed catalogue for such a large library as the British Museum Library. His testimony before the commissions presenting his views was considered to constitute not only an excellent notes to the rules but also a remarkable introduction to the foundations of cataloguing. The testimony covered many topics of recurring interest, such as, optimal level of bibliographical description and the relation of description to the objectives and functions of library catalogue; normalisation of names of persons and corporate bodies; problems of transliteration, title page transcription, etc.; entry for different forms of publications; treatment of modifications, adaptations, etc. of original works, anonymous publications, etc.; consistency and uniformity in application of cataloguing rules; nature of cross references; filing and arrangement of entries, and so on. It is perhaps for this reason that Panizzi's name came to be identified rather singly with the formulation of the rules. The job was entrusted to him and he led the team.

The printing of the catalogue was given up with the first volume. However, the manuscript project continued. In 1849, a guard book catalogue with entries copied on slips mounted on to the pages of large registers was devised which resulted in a 150 volume catalogue in 1851. Panizzi contended that author catalogue served the users the best, because, according to him most users preferred author approach as the basic approach. The rules therefore, provided for author catalogue with an index of matter (alphabetical subject index based on the subject words picked up from titles) appended to it.

The printed catalogue (in book format) cannot admit (fully descriptive) multiple entries lest it becomes impossibly bulky. As a measure of check against the bulk, one entry per book was the answer. Panizzi assumed that this single entry (under author) with sufficient description should serve as the principal/main entry with references (in lieu of added/additional entries) made to it.



To speak about the merits of the code, the British Museum Catalogue Rules continues the practices found as far back as in the catalogues of the medieval monastic libraries, some of which are reflected even in the present day practices as can be seen in AACR 2 and its 1988 revision. Among these practices are punctuations of headings, addition of qualifying phrases to names of certain classes of titled persons, recording of sizes (though the earlier designations were quite different) and more importantly the depth of description of a bibliographical item. The rules, particularly, those which dealt with anonymous publications evidently meant that the catalogue should serve as something more than a finding list. For this and many other reasons, it is considered as the founding code, which influenced the formulation of rules in all the subsequent codes. It became also the first major code to prescribe corporate entries. The rules sought corporate entry as default or as a means of organising publications of certain classes. Corporate publications were considered as forming part of anonymous works. All anonymous works were sought to be separated into three groups: 'corporate', 'form' and what could be called 'miscellaneous' headings groups.

In the first group were included publications of a) assemblies, hoards and other corporate bodies and, b) those of academies, universities and similar organisations, the former arranged in alphabetical order under the name of the country or place ("from which they derive their denominations or for want of such denominations under the name of the place from whence their acts are issued") and the latter under the form heading 'Academies', subarranged by continent and then country.

The second group covered special type of materials (where form was considered important) arranged under such headings as 'Periodical publications' (for reviews, magazines, newspapers, journals, gazettes, annuals, etc. periodical publications), 'ephemerides' (for almanacs, calendars, ephemeride, etc.) catalogues' (for anonymous catalogues, catalogues of public establishments and of private collections, general and special catalogues, dealers' catalogues, sale catalogues, etc.), 'liturgies' (for missals, breviaries, offices, horae, prayer books, liturgies, etc.) and, 'Bible' (for OT and NT and their parts).

The third group comprised of miscellaneous publications (not covered by rules for personal or corporate works or other categories) was arranged in order of preference as possible alternatives: under person (if named in title), or place name (if referred to in title), substantive (if lacking both person and place) and under first word (if not substantive in title).

In conclusion it can be said that the code was certainly a pioneering attempt although it lacked guiding principles to ensure consistency as needed especially for any subsequent formulation and addition of new rules for treating new types of materials which contingency was admittedly anticipated by Panizzi.

### 2.3.2 Jewett's Rules

Jewett, Charles Coffin. Smithsonian report on the construction of catalogues of libraries and their publication by means of separate stereotyped titles, with rules and examples. - 2nd ed. - Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1961. - Reprint of the original 2nd ed. published Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1853.

A small pamphlet, this was first published in 1852 under the title, The Smithsonian Report on the construction of catalogues of libraries, and their publication by means of stereo-titles contained a proposal and a plan of action envisioning a cooperative system of cataloguing through the application of the technology of stereo-typed plates for producing and printing of library catalogues. The second edition published in 1853 included 33 rules written by Jewett.

The Smithsonian Institution (Washington) was established in 1846 with the bequest made by the English chemist, James Smithson. The objective was to promote the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." What should be the means to accomplish this objective became a contentious issue. Charles Coffin Jewett, the librarian and assistant secretary of the institution felt that the best means to accomplish the objective was to develop the Smithsonian into a national library with legal depository rights incorporating as well a union catalogue of the holdings of all the public libraries in the United States which would eventually become a universal catalogue. His impassioned and eloquent assertion, "how much this would promote the progress of knowledge how much, by rebuking the rashness which rushes into authorship, ignorant of what others have written, and adding to the mass of books without adding to the sum of knowledge" is reflective of his strong conviction in his undertaking. Joseph Henry, a scientist, and the secretary, who was Jewett's superior held altogether a different view. He felt



that the Smithsonian institution served the cause better by providing financial assistance to the scientists to carry out their research. This clash of interests and views, "emblematic of the antagonism between the two cultures, Jewett representing literature and Henry, science reached its denouement with Jewett's dismissal from the Smithsonian."

Jewett's proposal envisioned a national system of centralised and cooperative cataloguing applying the then available, technology of stereotyped plates. The advantages claimed were economy in the cataloguing costs of individual libraries since printing and updating of the book catalogues was highly expensive while they still remained less efficient. So it could be obviated if each bibliographical record were stereotyped on a separate plate which would permit mass production of catalogues at a relatively reduced cost. Further it was said that the system would also ensure elimination of duplicate efforts, greater measure of uniformity, easy location of source for the books, greater access to bibliographic information, possible exchange of materials among the libraries, an American national bibliography and a future universal bibliography.

His plan called for preparation and submission of entries by the individual libraries according to the rules (drafted by Jewett), getting each single entry stereotyped and producing catalogues on demand by simply interfiling the new entries and printing. The process was inexpensive and so every library could as well have the required version of the catalogue (i.e., either the classed or alphabetical catalogue) compiled and printed. The use of stereotyped plates further would facilitate compilation of the union catalogue. The Smithsonian Institution as the national library and central agency would coordinate the entire programme. Besides maintaining the union catalogue it would also bring out monthly bulletin, annual and quinquennial catalogues for the books received by it through copy right. The idea was far ahead of the times and for want of wide support and for lack of proper technological material means, the project however, did not succeed.

According to Jewett, a library catalogue was a list of titles of books designed to show what the particular library contained. It was generally not required to give any more information "than the author gives or ought to give in the title page, and publisher, in imprint or colophon; except the designation of the form which is almost universally added. Persons who needed more information should seek for it in bibliographical dictionaries, literary histories or similar works". This means that he was advocating minimum description in catalogues based on the title page so that those who needed more bibliographical details would find them in bibliographical reference sources.

Like Panizzi, Jewett preferred alphabetical catalogue. His rules were basically the same as those of Panizzi but for minor modifications, He established the concept of corporate body more clearly and sought to place them in one category by providing for entry under the name of the body instead of place name or other, with cross references made from important substantive/adjective to the principal word in the name of the body. To achieve uniformity, he wanted anonymous works to be entered under the first word of the title (not an article) with cross-references made from sought terms. Pseudonymous works required entry under pseudonyms followed by the word, pseudo. If the author had used his real name in any edition, continuation or supplement, the pseudonym was not to be chosen for entry. Instead the real name was to be preferred because the author's identity is no more concealed.

For Jewett, anode was intended to promote uniformity in cataloguing among the libraries. He therefore, intended his code to be adopted by all libraries. For this purpose, he prescribed style, extended the principle of corporate entry, preferred the use of pseudonym (unless the real name also appeared in the publications) and required entry under first word than the subject word of the title for anonymous works (because title subject words were not uniformly standard ones). He established a principle that could be called the principle of standardization by stating that "the rules for cataloguing must be stringent and should meet so far as possible, all difficulties of detail. Nothing, so far can be avoided should be left to the individual taste or judgment of the cataloguer". He favoured legalistic approach, i.e., and a rule to meet every cataloguing problem and appeared to have preferred an enumerative code. Suffice to say that Jewett's rules like other codes of the time exerted great influence on the future development of catalogues and catalogue codes.

### 2.3 3 Cutter's Rules

Cutter, Charles Ammi. Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue. - 4th ed., rewritten. - Washington D .C.: Government Printing Office, 1904. - Republished: London: The Library Association, 1953.





The US Bureau of Education commissioned Cutter to write a status report on the public libraries in the United States to commemorate the nation's centenary year. The report, *Public libraries in the United States*, prepared, accordingly by Cutter, was published in 1876 along with his code entitled, *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog* which constituted the second part of the report.

Considered as a "landmark work," and described as an "epitome of the cataloguing art of the period," the rules presented consistent summary of the ideas and works of most leading librarians of the time, evincing particularly, the influence of Panizzi, Jewett, Perkins, Poole and many others.

The first edition (1F) contained 205 rules which was tested by applying to the Boston Athanaeum and the rules then were revised and expanded, and continued through the fourth edition (the second edition published in 1889, the third in 1891 and the fourth posthumously in 1904). The fourth (and the final) edition contained 369 rules. The Library Association (UK)

later brought out at least three reprints of this final edition (1938, 1948 and 1953) which is proof enough of the popularity of the code even long after the demise of the author. Ranganathan commenting about the code had to say that "RDC [Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue] is indeed a classic. It is immortal. Its influence has been overpowering. It inhibits free rethinking even today. Being a one man's creation it has been largely apprehended intuitively. This is why RDC is whole as an egg". Indeed the value of the code diminished the least even to this day.

The chief merit of the code lies in the pragmatism applied by the author in the making of the rules and in setting forth "what might be called a set of first principles" to govern the creation of rules and their practical application.

Although, generally, many cite three principles as having been articulated by Cutter, he indeed postulated more than three.

The first principle may be called the 'principle of convenience of the public.' Cutter declared that "cataloguing is an art, not a science. No rules can take the place of experience and good judgment but some of the results of experience may best be indicated by rules." His emphasis was on pragmatism, i.e., practical experience and proper judgment. According to Cutter, the convenience of the public is always to be set before the ease of the cataloguer. In most cases, they may coincide. A plain rule without exceptions is not only easy for us to carry out but easy for the public to understand and work by. But strict consistency in a rule and uniformity in application sometimes lead to practices which clash with the public's habitual way of looking at things. When the habits are general and deeply rooted, it is unwise for the cataloguer to ignore them, even if they demand a sacrifice of system and simplicity." He favoured, therefore, wherever needed, flexibility of rules and sensitivity to user's requirements. He was opposed to Jewett's legalistic approach (i.e., a cataloguing rule for every cataloguing problem), insistence on strict application of rules and adherence to consistency. Consistency, no doubt, is a virtue but it cannot be an absolute and unviolable principle.

The second principle is the 'principle of collocation.' Cutter, however, did not use the term, collocation. He meant it by stating that the catalogue should facilitate location of all books of an author (i.e., entries for all books of an author) by bringing them together in one place. For, he believed that catalogue was something more than a mere finding list "for a given book by an author."

The third principle relates to subject entry/heading. This may be called the 'principle of specific and consistent subject entry.'

Besides these three principles, a couple of principles may also be inferred and added.

The fourth one may be termed as the 'principle of adequate description.' Cutter did not name it. A library could accordingly, adopt the rules in a code wholly or partially (i.e., in varying degrees of details) depending upon the nature and size of the collection as well as the objectives of the library;

A further principle which can also be surmised is the 'principle of probable association.' The choice of entry (from among possible alternative methods), Cutter started, "choose that entry that will probably be 'first looked under by the class of people who use the library."

Structurally, it is a well laid comprehensive code, the rules covering the whole of cataloguing procedures. It is organised in three parts. The first part constitutes the preliminaries or prefatory notes. Cutter discussed in this part some basic issues,



such as objects of catalogue, the means and methods to attain them, definitions (of cataloguing terms) including a note on classification of particular value is the statement of objects, means and methods. Some claim this too as a set of empirical principles. It is as follows:

"Objects: 1. To enable a person to find a book of which either (a) the author, (b) the title, (c) the subject is known. 2. To show what the library has (d) by a given author, (e) on a given subject, (f) in a given kind of literature. 3. To assist in the choice of a book (g) as to its edition (bibliographically) (h) to its character (literary or topical).

Means: Author entry with the necessary reference (for a and d). 2. Title entry or title reference (for b.) 3. Subject entry, cross reference, and classed subject table (for c and e) 4. Form entry and language entry (for f) 5. Giving edition and imprint, with notes when necessary (for g). 6. Notes (for h)

Reasons for choice: Among the several possible methods of attaining the objects other things being equal, choose that entry, (1) that will probably be first looked under by the class of people who use the library; (2.) that is consistent with other entries so that one principle can cover all; (3) that will mass entries least, in places where it is difficult to so arrange them that they can be readily found, as under names of nations and cities."

Although it is said that Cutter's code found refuge in tradition it certainly helped a codification of policies needed by American Libraries. Many issues raised by him became the subject of intensive debate in later period. Akers' observation that after 1876, "there has been no further development in principles although an enormous amount of work has been done in amplifying, codifying, and clarifying rules, which has contributed to a needed uniformity of practice", is a comment indeed on the positive as well as the negative sides of the influence that Cutter's code exerted on the subsequent efforts of code making. This aspect will be revealing itself as we progress in studying the later codes.

#### **2.3.4 AA Code of 1908**

Cataloguing rules: author and title entries / compiled by Committees of the Library Association and the American Library Association. - English edition. - London: Library Association, 1908. - American edition: Chicago: American Library Association, 1908.

At the turn of the present century there were divergent codes in application among the libraries both in America and in England. American libraries were using various codes such as Cutter's rules, ALA rules, Dewey's rules, etc. In addition, the introduction of printed card distribution by the Library of Congress made many libraries to adhere to the LC's practice. In England, the BM rules, LA rules, Bodleian rules, etc. were in use among the libraries. There was a renewed debate over the need for a sound philosophy of cataloguing to find better solutions to the problems of bibliographic organisation and to establish cooperative and centralised systems for ensuring greater uniformity and economy in cataloguing practices.

The aim was to meet the "requirements of larger libraries of a scholarly character". This set the precedent so that the subsequent codes were similarly aimed at and were largely drawn up primarily oriented to the needs of large research libraries. On account of practical considerations; the code had to work out compromise between the differing practices of the LC and other American research libraries. Next, because the two collaborating American and British groups could not reach full agreement on all details, alternative rules were made to accommodate the British and American preferences that differed. As a result the code was published in two somewhat differing texts (American and English texts).

The code created a labyrinth of corporate entry and made the dubious distinction as between society and association on one hand and institution (restricted to permanent establishments) on the other hand. However, it laid emphasis on and wide application of authorship principle. It presented a slightly better definition of author over the one given by Cutter.

It was an incomplete code without rules for description, subject cataloguing and filing, But it came into wide use in the libraries in both the countries including a few other nations where English was the library language.

#### **2.3.5 Prussian Instructions**

The Prussian instructions. Rules for the alphabetical catalogues of the Prussian libraries I translated from the 2nd edition, authorized, 1908; with an introduction and notes by Andrew D Osborn. \_ Ann Arbor Mich: University of Michigan Press, 1938.



A committee was appointed to study the Royal Library Code (i.e., the modified Instructions of Dziatzko) to make improvements in the matter of bibliographical description. This resulted in the Prussian Instructions, i.e., *Instruktionen für die Alphabetischen catalogue der Prussian Bibliotheken*, published in 1899. Its English translation rendered by A D Osborn was published in 1938.

This code represented the German practice which differed from the Anglo-American tradition, at least in two aspects. It prescribed grammatical rather than mechanical title. In title entry, the first grammatically independent word instead of first word (other than article) as opposed to Anglo-American practice, was prescribed. The second major difference was that the code did not accept the concept of corporate authorship. It treated corporate publications as a class of anonymous publications.

### **2.3.6 Vatican Rules**

Vatican Library. Rules for the Catalogue of Printed Books I translated from the 2nd Italian edition 1938, by the very Rev. Thomas J. Shanahan, Victor A. Shaefer, Constantine T. Vesselowsky; Wyllis E. Wright, editor. -- Chicago: American Library Association, 1948. - 3rd Italian edition published in 1949.

The code was the result of a decision taken in 1927 to prepare a new catalogue of the printed books in the Vatican Library (Rome) which was in the process of reorganisation. Since the catalogue of the Original collection prepared at the end of the 17th century was incomplete and also outmoded, a new up-to-date catalogue was contemplated.

Because of the involvement of the American experts and of American trained personnel, the code reflected American bias. Wyllis E. Wright, who wrote the foreword to the English translation of the code claimed it as "the most complete statement of American cataloguing practice."

Next to Cutter's rules, this was the other code that was a complete and comprehensive code, covering all the aspects of cataloguing. It provided for entry (author, title entries), description, subject headings and filing. The rules for subject cataloguing stated general principles and included instructions on forms and specific areas of application. It is also claimed as an international code.

### **2.3.7 Classified Catalogue Code**

Ranganathan (Shiyali Ramamrita) (1892-1972). Classified Catalogue Code with Additional Rules for Dictionary Catalogue Code. Ed 5. Assisted by A Neelameghan.

The first edition appeared in 1934 and was continued through five editions, the last (i.e., the 5th edition) coming in 1964. Each later edition was an improvement on the earlier one, the revision, addition or improvement made on the basis of practical application and critical examination supported by teaching and reasoning. This empirical, analytical and critical approach shaped the code progressively.

The second edition (1945) demonstrated the symbiotic relationship between classification and cataloguing and evolved chain procedure for subject cataloguing/indexing. Rules for style of writing and alphabetisation correlating the two through Gestalt theory of alphabetisation were other added features of this edition.

Ranganathan's comparative study of classified and dictionary, catalogues and evaluation of Cutter's rules helped him publish his Dictionary Catalogue Code in 1945.

The third edition (1951) added rules for compiling union catalogue of periodical publications, abstracting periodical and incorporating as well, a glossary of English Sanskrit terms to be helpful for developing cognate terminology in other Indian languages.

The fourth edition (1955) implemented the lay-out for a catalogue code (in the light of Heading and Canons), added supplementary rules for national bibliography, rearranged the rules for determination of authorship, choice of heading and rendering the heading. It also incorporated further additional rules for style of writing effecting corresponding changes in the rules for alphabetisation. This edition, as a result of his comparative study of five codes (Heading and Canons published in 1955) made necessary further corrections and alterations which eliminated the need for a separate dictionary catalogue code.



The fifth edition (1964) included new chapters on Law of parsimony, physical form, centralized cataloguing, homonyms in class index entries and feature headings, and non-conventional documents. Typographical and other simple errors were corrected, a little rewording was done and better examples were added.

While the codes for alphabetical, author and dictionary catalogues are quite large in number, the codes oriented to classified catalogue are few in number. Ranganathan's Classified Catalogue code (CCC) is one prominent code of these few. After Cutter's rules and Vatican code, the CCC is the only other code which is complete to cover all the cataloguing procedures and to provide rules for entry, description, subject cataloguing/indexing and filing.

Before Ranganathan, there were no catalogue codes ever produced in India. Neither was there an established bibliographic/cataloguing tradition. The code (CCC) is the first and the only code designed in India. It was mostly an intuitive effort but applying scientific method to ensure precision and correctness. This however, does not go to say that the code was entirely a product of pristine mind. Ranganathan, educated in England had the benefit of exposure to western thought and practice, which definitely provided the needed background to work out independently. There are, therefore, many influences. Yet the code is distinctively Ranganathan's own. What is his own adds to the merit, and what is not to its weakness.

Structurally, it is a well laid code. The code can be divided into three units. The first 9 parts/chapters (A to H and D form the approach. Many basic issues, more importantly, canons and normative principles; parts and physical forms of catalogue, centralised cataloguing; recording, style, language and script, arrangement of entries; conflict of authorship and resolution (determination of authorship); name of person, (i.e., structure, element, etc.) are dealt with. The next 11 chapters (K to N, P to V) constitute the substantial part, i.e., rules for rendering names (persons, corporate bodies, geographical entities); preparation of class Index entries; main and book index entries for different categories of books and periodicals; additional rules for compilation of union catalogues of books and periodical publications; National bibliography; indexing periodical; abstracting periodical; and cataloguing of incunabula and non-book materials. The last part (W) constitutes end matter (glossary of terms, bibliographic references and index).

The rules are marked for their simplicity, clarity and brevity. The code draws a distinction between a library catalogue and a bibliography. Elaborate description is a necessity in bibliography and not in a library catalogue. Therefore, CCC does not prescribe recording of imprint, collation, many details in notes, statement of responsibility in the title section, etc. The rules for determining authorship are based on a set of problems explained as conflicts of authorship. The rules relating to rendering of names/headings for persons, corporate bodies and geographic entities are based on language, nationality and cultural preferences which are postulated through principles.

The empirical approach and application of normative principles in drafting and arranging the rules have CCC a model code. The fact that it does not cover the entire range of various types of material makes it a less comprehensive code. No code can be perfect in all details. CCC is no exception.

It needs revision and rethinking so as to capture and respond to the many changes that have come about after its publication in 1964.

### **2.3.8 ALA Rules (prel 2nd ed)**

American Library Association. ALA Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries. - Prel 2nd ed. - Chicago: American Library Association, 1941.

Within two decades of implementation of the joint code of 1908, libraries in America as well as in England began voicing dissatisfaction. In America, libraries which received the LC printed cards (introduced in 1901) revised their existing catalogues to conform to the LC practice. Large research libraries found it difficult to apply the 1908 code to new classes of materials acquired by them because of lack of rules covering such items. So, to respond to the demands of the libraries further revision or recodification of rules had to be taken up.

The rules were organised in two parts, viz., entry and heading, and description.

The code followed the existing practices than prescribing the ideal and the right. The attempt to render all the bibliographic variations into something like a statute law was stated as the principal fault of this draft code. The professional opposition to the size and the complexity



of the code first manifested in the area of descriptive cataloguing and next, of course, in the rules for author and title entries. Further improvement (revision work) on part 2 (description) was therefore deferred or given up.

### **2.3.9 L C Descriptive Rules**

Library of Congress. Rules for Descriptive cataloging at the Library of Congress Adopted by the American Library Association. - Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1949.

As evident from the title, it was adopted and given official recognition by the American Library Association as the standard for descriptive cataloguing. As a natural consequence, it replaced the second part (i.e., descriptive rules) in 1949 ALA rules, 2nd definitive edition which was also published by the ALA in the same year.

#### **ALA Rules (2nd definitive edition)**

American Library Association. ALA cataloging rules for author and title entries. - 2nd ed. / Clara Beetle, editor. - Chicago: American Library Association, 1949.

The criticism of the 1941 draft code of ALA rules faulted the code in general and the descriptive rules part more in particular. The code needed revision, recasting and finalisation.

This code (1949. ALA 2nd ed.) was limited to rules for entry and heading only. It represented somewhat an expansion and elaboration of the 1908 code. It did not state and apply any guiding principles. The code proved exceedingly complicated to use.

For about a decade and a half (i.e., until the AACR I appeared) the arrangement of using the twin codes (the 1949 ALA 2nd ed. and the 1949 LC rules) in conjunction as the American standards for cataloguing continued.

But cataloguers always found it tedious and inconvenient to have to refer to one code for entry and heading work and another for description. Since the LC code of descriptive rules covered printed material only, it required the use of other aids or standards for describing other non-print items (e.g., LC's Motion pictures and film strips, Phonorecords, and Picture designs and other two-dimensional representations - three separate booklets).

Like the earlier preliminary draft second edition, the definitive second edition too was targeted for criticism. While the LC descriptive rules looked forward, the ALA code looked backward. A more coherent and unified code therefore was demanded.

#### **AACR 1(1967)**

Anglo-American cataloging rules / prepared by the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association, and the Canadian Library Association. - North American ext.- Chicago : American library Association, 1967. - Reprinted in 1970 with supplement of additions and changes. - British text published : London Library Association, 1967.

At this time, the long cherished goal of international code renewed itself and appeared a possibility. The International Conference on Cataloguing Principles convened in Paris in October 1961, adopted and accepted a statement of principles in whole or part by delegations from 53 countries and 12 international organisations. The Report of the International Conference was issued in 1963. It drew upon Lubetzky's 1960 code and restated the objectives of both Lubetzky and Cutter. The statement of principles rested on the objectives and were expressed in specific terms. The importance of this report lies in its endorsement of corporate entry and establishment of natural rather than grammatical order of arrangement of title, thus, removing the major differences between the Anglo-American and Germanic traditions of cataloguing. Following the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles many other national catalogue codes were revised or developed, eg, the German Code (Regeln für die alphabetische Katalogisierung, the Swedish code, the Danish code, etc.), leveling the differences between national practices. The new code (known as AACR 1) appeared in 1967 and was received by the profession with, a mixed reaction. The rules in the code were organised in 2 parts, part 1 dealing with entry and heading consisting of four chapters, and part 2 covering description presented in 10 chapters.

The code applied reevaluation of the existing practices. It was seen as a better code in terms of its more logical grouping of the rules with emphasis on conditions of authorship rather than on classes of authors (married women, princes of blood, etc) and kinds of publications (anna,



dictionaries, encyclopaedias, etc). It corresponded, more than the earlier codes to the patterns of intelligent users instead of blindly ruling preparation of entries, which may be precise, consistent and technically correct. It gave preference to the form of name preferred or used by the author than his real/official name. Title page of the item catalogued was prescribed as the source of information for cataloguing against the old practice of deriving details from outside sources. Similarly, in the case of change of names of corporate bodies, entry was required under the changed/new name. The code, further emphasised the function of assembling bibliographic units by providing uniform title entry more widely. But some of the vestiges of old practices remained. For example, the authorial status to editors and compilers, entry under place names for certain corporate bodies continued. On this and certain other points since the American and British Committees could not reach agreement, the code was published in two slightly differing texts like the 1908 code.

When work on AACR 1 began, books and periodicals were the basic and popular materials. Card catalogue was the norm. But when the code appeared in 1967 the situation changed vastly. As a result of technology, a variety of new media (non-book materials) found their way into libraries. Computer manipulation of data made possible other forms of catalogue. The need to integrate the descriptive records (catalogue entries) of different forms of material (book and non-book items) necessitated studies to find analogies between their characteristics). IFLA brought out a document entitled International Standard Bibliographic Description (for single and multi-volume monographic publications) in 1971. This was later improved/revised and published in 1974 as ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications, 1st standard ed. Along with it another standard for serials, viz., ISBD(S) International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials was also published. The AACR I incorporated these documents and revised chapter 6 (separately published monographs) in 1974 followed by chapter 12 (for audio-visual media and special instructional materials) in 1975 and chapter 14 (for sound recordings) in 1976. IFLA's International standards for other kinds of material including a general one followed in succession.

This piecemeal revision was found unsatisfactory. It needed development of overall principles and integration of descriptive rules for various media. The expanded cooperation between the cataloguing agencies in Great Britain, America and other countries as well as the increase in the use of UKMARC and LCMARC brought about agreement for a single unified text of code, the ambiguities and differences resolved.'

### **AACR 2 (1978)**

Anglo-American cataloging rules/ Prepared by the American Library Association, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Library Association, the Library of Congress; edited by Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler. 2nd ed. - London: Library Association; Chicago : American Library Association, 1978.

This second edition proved superior revealing basic principles that provided the edifice of the code. It followed "the sequence of cataloguers' operations in most present-day libraries and bibliographic agencies," i.e., first examining the item and describing it and then determining the access points. The code therefore, presented the descriptive rules in part 1 followed by rules for determining and establishing headings/access points in part 2. Part 1 begins with a general chapter which can be applied to all materials in general followed by chapters on specific media which are elaborations of the provisions of the general chapter. These rules were also based on ISBDs (the general and specific ones). In the description the code permitted alternative rules and options to suit the needs of the libraries and cataloguing agencies. In the rules for access points, it worked out many terminological improvements to remove conceptual irritants, eg, statement of responsibility in place of statement of authorship, corporate entry, instead of corporate author, etc. It standardized punctuation to conform to the pattern established in ISBDs.

### **AACR 2, 1988 revised**

Anglo-American cataloging rules/ prepared under the direction of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR, a committee of the American Library Association, the Australian Committee on Cataloguing, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing the Library Association, the Library of Congress; edited by Michael Gorman and Paul, W Winkler. - 2nd ed., 1988 revision. - Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London : Library Association Publishing Limited; Chicago: American Library Association, 1988.



The implementation of AACR 2 (1978) code was begun by the Library of Congress in Jan 1981. Like the earlier edition (AACR1), the second edition too appeared at a time when there were rapid developments taking place. More important and of greater immediate relevance was the emergence of many new forms of material which were still in shaping.

Although the code (AACR2) resolved the problems of authorship more satisfactorily, the rules were found inadequate in dealing with new media. In course of implementation of the code, some rules presented themselves as confusing, insufficient and complicated. This gave rise to differences in interpretation. Therefore, attempts were made to clarify, expand or alter rules in necessary cases. The Library of Congress notified the interpretations and modifications in its Cataloguing service bulletin.

Three sets of revisions of AACR 2 comprising of Geographical corrections, Textual amendments, and altered and additional rules were issued in 1982, 1984 and 1986. These were followed also by a draft revision of chapter .9 for computer files. The code too came into wider use and found translations in many languages (e.g., Arabic, Bahasa Malaysia, Chinese, Danish, Finnish, French, Italian, Japanese, Norwegian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish, Urdu and possibly others) In view of the changes and additions that were brought out and the growing popularity and use of the code, it was decided to revise it. The revised code, it was further decided, to be named as AACR 2, 1988 revision and not as 3rd edition. The revision sought to incorporate the additions and modifications already made as well as further revisions contemplated, viz., description of material for the blind (tactile), rethinking of the concept of separate bibliographical identities, treatment of titles, author headings, geographic names and corporate bodies, corrections, rewording and addition of new examples.

The revision, therefore, did not result either in the change of basic concepts, principles or structure. While the prominent changes applied to computer files, other changes related to the material for the blind, sound recordings, music, etc. In order to achieve greater conformity in establishing headings, a few rules were changed. These changes include redetermining of title proper, redesignation of GMD in a few instances, addition of distinctions in the rules for choice of pseudonyms, deletion of option to qualify place names (by adding larger areas/ jurisdictions), addition of geographical identifiers to identical corporate bodies, redefining the type 3 subordinate corporate body, recasting of uniform titles, entry additionally under corporate name (other than publisher, distributor, etc.) in the case of some cartographic material, etc.

The rules are presented in two parts (as was the case also in the 2nd ed). Part one consists of descriptive rules in 13 chapters. Chapter 1 has the general rules which provide the general frame within which descriptive rules for specific classes of material follow. Chapter 13 also contains general rules for analysis of specific types. These are as follows

Part 1 Description: Chapters 1. General rules of description, 2. Books, Pamphlets and Monographs; 3. Cartographic Materials, 4 Manuscripts (including manuscript collections), 5. Music (Published music), 6. Sound Recordings, 7. Motion Pictures and Video Recordings, 8. Cartographic Materials, 9. Computer Files, 10. Three-dimensional Artifacts and Realia, 11. Microform, 12. Serials and 13. Analysis

Part 2. Headings, uniform titles and references: Chapters 21. Choice .of Access Points, 22. Headings for Persons, 23. Geographic Names, 24. Headings for Corporate Bodies, 25. Uniform Titles, and 26. References

The third part constitutes the end matter. It consists of Appendixes, A. Capitalization, B. Abbreviations, C. Numerals, and D. Glossary, and an Index.

Each part has one introductory chapter. The rules in the 12 chapters of part 1 (Description) have mnemonic numbering to facilitate to and fro reference to rules applying to appropriate areas. The descriptive rules are presented first, obviously because cataloguing begins with description, then follow the tasks of determination and establishment of headings. So, rules for access points, choice of forms of headings are given in the second part. The gap between Chapters 13 and 21 is left to incorporate descriptive rules for new classes of materials that may come (in which case Chapter 13 may be renumbered). In both parts the rules follow the order of general to specific. The code has provision for optional rules and alternative rules- to accommodate the varying requirements of libraries.



The preface states that "cataloging rules cannot be static, they must be allowed to respond to changing needs". What is meant by this is that revision does not stop at any time. It goes on. Further revisions become necessary. So, for the present, AACR 2, 1988 revision is the latest in the Anglo-American family of codes. All the earlier ones stand superseded.

### Self Check Exercise

- 3) What used to be the basic difference between the Germanic and Anglo-American cataloguing traditions until recent times?

**Note:** i) Write your answer in the space given below.

ii) Check your answer with the answers given at the end of this Unit.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

## 2.4 SUMMARY

In this Unit, we pursued three basic themes. In the first instance, we examined the 'what and why' of cataloguing and catalogue code. Then we traced briefly the evolution of catalogue and cataloguing practice and noted the factors that influenced and shaped both. Besides, we also identified a few principles that surfaced. All this forming the background, we made a quick survey of the history and development of catalogue codes beginning with 19th century and in the process studied in detail, some of the important codes as to their scope or coverage, provisions of rules, underlying principles, etc.

## 2.5 ANSWERS TO SELF CHECK EXERCISES

1. A library catalogue code is a set of rules for guidance of cataloguers in the preparation of descriptive bibliographic records, i.e., entries in catalogues, bibliographies, etc. for books and similar materials so as to ensure consistency and uniformity.
2. An inventory is a simple list of documents meant to locate and their safe keeping. The finding list is an improved list that facilitates finding a specific book by a given author. The catalogue is a bibliographic tool containing multiple entries with adequate description that answers a variety of enquiries.
3. In the title entry, the Germanic tradition prescribed the first grammatically independent word while the Anglo-American tradition followed mechanical title. The other difference was that unlike the Anglo-American system, the Germanic tradition did not accept the concept of corporate authorship.

## 2.6 KEY WORDS

**Bibliographic Control:** Mastery over written and published records, i.e., effective access to sources of information through bibliographies, catalogues, databases, etc.

### Council and Synodal

**Proceedings:** Proceedings (publications) of, religious congregations, ecclesiastical meetings, etc.

**Book Press:** Case or shelf for keeping books/manuscripts were known as book presses.





<b>Empirical Method:</b>	Any thing derived by experience and is also verifiable through experience.
<b>Epistles:</b>	Religious instructional materials, usually extracts from biblical works.
<b>GMD (General Material</b>	
<b>Designation):</b>	A designation for a class of materials added in cataloguing according to AACR2 following the title to specify the physical medium category.
<b>Homilies:</b>	Sermons, lectures, etc. for reading in churches and other similar occasions.
<b>Lectionaries:</b>	Books containing passage or extracts or selections from sacred writings for reading in divine services.
<b>Liturgies:</b>	Books of rituals to conduct public worship.
<b>Syndetic Devices:</b>	Systems and means to connect or relate entries in catalogue, bibliography, etc. (see and see also references).
<b>Vicissitude:</b>	Change in circumstances.

---

## 2.8 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

---

Foundations of Cataloguing: A Source Book / ed. by Michael Carpenter and Elaine Svenonius. - Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1985.

Hanson, Eugene R. and Daily, Jay E. 1974. Catalogs and Cataloging. In, Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science. - London: Marcel Dekker. vol 4, pp. 242-305..

Norris, Dorothy Mary. 1939. A History of Cataloguing and Cataloguing Methods, 1100-1850 with an introductory survey of ancient times. - London Grafton and Co.

Krishan Kumar (1993). Cataloguing. New Delhi : Har-Anand Publications.

Chan, Lois Mai (1994). Cataloging and Classification.: An Introduction. 2d ed. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Tripathi, S.M. (1969). Modern Cataloguing Theory and Practice. Agra: Shival Agarwala.