

The Genesis of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules

by MARGARET F. MAXWELL

The roots of the code of cataloging rules now in use by libraries, the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* of 1967, go deep, at least to 1841 and Anthony Panizzi's famed ninety-one rules for the cataloging of works at the British Museum. These rules furnished the foundation for the thirty-four *Rules for Preparing Catalogues* which Charles Coffin Jewett of the Smithsonian Institution set forth in 1852 as a proposed national code for library cataloging.¹

In 1858, Jewett became the first superintendent of the Boston Public Library. His cataloging rules were followed in preparing the printed book catalogs of that institution. Jewett died at the age of fifty-two, in 1868, while still superintendent. Not long before his death he hired a young man, one Charles Ammi Cutter, who was at the time an assistant cataloger at the Harvard University Library, to prepare a catalog of a special collection in the Boston Library. Thus Cutter and Jewett came to know one another and the younger man had an opportunity to work closely with Jewett and with his code of cataloging rules.

Simultaneously with his special project at the Boston Public Library, Cutter was assisting the librarian of the Harvard University Library, Ezra Abbot, on the recataloging of that library. Abbot's catalog was a public card catalog, rather than a manuscript or printed bound volume as was more usual at the time. The catalog was divided into two parts: an author catalog and a classed catalog with the main classes arranged alphabetically; subdivisions under these main classes were also alphabetical. Eight years of close collaboration with Abbot (1860-1868) certainly left an indelible impression on Cutter as he developed his own philosophies of library service and the function of the catalog in the library.

In December 1868, Charles Cutter was appointed Librarian of the Boston Athenaeum. One of his most pressing tasks was the compilation of a printed catalog of the collection. He tells us that it was "the result of experience acquired in printing the first 1300 pages of [this] catalogue"² that crystallized his ideas into the first definite statement of what he himself referred

The author is Associate Professor, Graduate Library School, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

Libri 1977: vol. 27: no. 3: pp. 238-262.

to as "the first principles of cataloguing".³ The rules that stemmed from these first principles constitute a code of cataloging so reasoned and so complete that many of its stipulations remain unchanged as part of our cataloging rules to this day.

Cutter begins his *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog* (the title was changed in later editions to *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*) with a short prefatory statement in which he sets forth first the objects of cataloging and next the means by which these objects can be attained. The objectives state plainly the two sometimes dichotomous purposes of the library catalog: that it should be a finding list for the library's collection, and that it should serve to bring together in one place such literary units as the works of an author, and all editions, translations, etc. of individual works. Cutter's "Object 1" states the finding list principle:

1. To enable a person to find a book of which either
 - (A) the author
 - (B) the title is known.
 - (C) the subject

Objects 2 and 3 state the "literary unit" principle:

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) as to its character (literary or topical)⁴

Cutter's 205 rules (368 in the 1904 edition) constitute the most searching attempt made up to his time to set forth the principles of cataloging and to apply them in a systematic way to a detailed code. Not only did he delineate the fundamental purposes of the catalog; he also set forth as an axiom, not seriously disputed by cataloging experts during the next three quarters of a century, that these purposes can best be served by the principle of authorship. This means that the heading for the bibliographical unit will be the name of the person or corporate body chiefly responsible for the intellectual content of the work.

Influential though they were, Cutter's *Rules* did not win universal acceptance among librarians as a code for the construction of catalogs either in the United States or Great Britain. The Anglo-American Code of 1908

was the first successful product of British and American cooperation. The rules embodied in this code were followed in this country from the time of their publication until 1941 when the preliminary edition of the ALA Cataloging Rules appeared. Even further, until the publication of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* in 1967, the 1908 Anglo-American code was, along with Cutter's *Rules*, the official code for most British public libraries.

The Anglo-American code of 1908⁵ had its roots in the same purpose which produced Jewett's *Rules* of 1852: the desire for uniformity in cataloging practice with the ultimate aim of cooperative as well as centralized cataloging for libraries. Drawn up by the cooperative efforts of committees from the American Library Association and the (British) Library Association, it was specifically designed for "large libraries of a scholarly character".⁶ As such, its rules came under criticism fairly early as being unnecessarily complex, and unsuited to the needs of smaller, more popular libraries. However, at least in comparison with its successor, the *ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries* of 1949, it was in many respects a model of simplicity and good organization. The arrangement of the 1908 code is roughly similar to that of Cutter's *Rules*. Following a preface and some definitions of terms used in the rules, the code begins with rules for entry and heading (Rules 1-135). Following these, rules for descriptive cataloging are given (Rules 136-174).

The Anglo-American code of 1908 has been criticized on much the same grounds on which its successors, the *ALA Rules* of 1949, was faulted. There is no introductory statement of principles; thus, related rules are separated and many of the rules are simply enumerations of types of problems. The rules differentiating societies and institutions are unnecessarily complex and show a lack of understanding of the basic problems governing corporate entry. But however clearly its weakness stand out a half century after its publication, the Anglo-American code of 1908 remains a triumph of cooperation which marked the beginning of a real movement in favor of international cooperation in cataloging. Not only had the British and American committees managed to reach almost unanimous agreement on their respective cataloging rules, but also, in the interest of possible even wider agreement and cooperation between national groups, the committees had consulted and considered the German *Prussian Instructions* (1899), the Spanish *Instrucciones* (1902), and Fumagilli's (Italian) rules of 1887.⁷

J. C. M. Hanson, addressing the Conference Internationale de Bibliographie et de Documentation in Brussels, July 1908, looked forward to the day when not only American and British catalogers might agree on a common code of cataloging rules, but to the day when each country would

furnish catalog copy for books published in that country to every nation in the world.⁸ Hanson's dream, which he was still hopefully pursuing in 1939 with the publication of his *Comparative Study of Cataloging Rules*, is still in the offing, but prospects seem brighter today for the eventual realization of international agreement than ever before. The Anglo-American code of 1908 stands as one of the most important building blocks in the development of an internationally acceptable code of cataloging.

The Age of the Saber-Tooth Tiger: the ALA Cataloging Rules of 1949

Following the adoption of the Anglo-American code by the cataloging profession in 1908, further development and revision of the cataloging rules came to a standstill, as far as any official word from the American Library Association was concerned, at least. The Library of Congress continued to issue printed cards, and as new problems came up that had not been covered by the 1908 code, Library of Congress catalogers made decisions to cover these special cases. From time to time, an informal notice from the Library of Congress would be circulated among librarians, telling them of a new ruling or change in policy at the Library of Congress. For the most part, catalogers outside the Library of Congress either made up their own supplementary rules or tried to guess the policies of the Library of Congress as reflected in its printed cards.

By 1930 a definite need was felt for a revision of the quarter-century old Anglo-American code. J. C. M. Hanson, American chairman for the 1908 code, spoke at the New Orleans Conference of the American Library Association, April 27, 1932, recommending additions, expansions, and improvements in the code.⁹ A catalog revision committee was appointed to "make necessary revisions in the ALA Catalog rules with authority to cooperate with the Library Association of Great Britain and with such other national library associations as it may think appropriate".¹⁰

Julia Pettee, a member of the catalog revision committee, seemed to speak for most catalogers of the 1930's in her article, "Code Revision - What do Catalogers Want?". Her feeling was that catalogers wanted "expansions of existing rules and more examples under them", rather than a basically different code. The Anglo-American code had been based on two sound structural principles, said Miss Pettee, first, "the function of the author catalog [is] to assemble literary units", and second, "true authorship entries are best calculated to bring these units together in the catalog". Thus any future revisions would be based on the existing rules as given in the 1908 code.¹¹

And this is precisely what was done. Utilizing reports and suggestions

from individual catalogers, supplementary rules of the Library of Congress, decisions of the Cooperative Cataloging Committee of the American Library Association, printed cards files of the Library of Congress, and printed rules for special types of material issued principally by the Library of Congress, the revision committee in the course of the next decade built a monumental superstructure on the slender framework of the eighty-eight page Anglo-American code of 1908.¹² Some correspondence with the British committee for code revision resulted in "substantial agreement in the sections of the tentative rules on which the British Committee had made a definite report".¹³ The start of World War II, however, put a stop to any thoughts of further international collaboration, except for comparison by the American committee of the proposed code with the Vatican *Norme* and the Prussian *Instructions*.¹⁴ The revised code, therefore, was in no sense a joint Anglo-American venture.

Rudolph Gjelsness, chairman of the 1941 Catalog Code Revision Committee, stated that "dissatisfaction with the 1908 code rested not with its inclusions but rather with its omissions . . . Expansion was needed, rather than change".¹⁵ The Preliminary American Second Edition of the *Rules* appeared in 1941, and it is evident even on casual inspection that this is exactly what had been done. The revised rules were collated for easy comparison with the 1908 rules. The 135 rules for entry and heading of 1908 which occupied forty-two pages now numbered 224 rules and 237 pages. Some of the expansion was due to the addition of a great number of useful examples; however, most of the growth was due to enumerative rules drawn up to fit specific problems, with no regard for the principles governing these problems.

The preliminary *ALA Catalog Rules* appeared early in 1941; in the October 1941 issue of *Library Quarterly* appeared an article which sounded the battle-cry of opponents of the revised code. Andrew Osborne's "The Crisis in Cataloging" decried the 1941 revision of the *Rules* as a violation of the basic principles of cataloging. Discussing four theories of cataloging, the legalistic, the perfectionist, the bibliographic, and the pragmatic, he claimed that the 1941 code, with its attempt to formulate minute rules for every possible circumstance, was legalistic; that is, it was bound by rules and definitions and not based on principle. Under a pragmatic code of cataloging, on the other hand, said Osborn, rules and definitions are made only as they seem necessary; they are not ends in themselves. Pragmatic cataloging would be adapted to the needs of individual libraries; catalogers would use their own judgment rather turning to standard rules for authoritative guidance on every detail.

In bald outline, Osborn seems to be calling for a return to the confused

state of disunity that existed in library practices of the nineteenth century. But he made one point in regard to the 1941 code which was well taken: "Codification tends to obscure reasons and principles".¹⁶

Osborn's clarion call for a return to basic principles electrified the library world. It was reprinted as a pamphlet and distributed to librarians all over the United States. Everyone read it, everyone talked about it, and some people wrote about it.¹⁷ At the Library of Congress Osborn's criticism caused administrators to take a hard look at the descriptive cataloging rules which made up Part 2 of the 1941 Code. What, actually, were the legitimate functions of descriptive cataloging?

At this point, Seymour Lubetzky stepped into the picture. A cataloger who had already made a name for himself as a highly original critic and analyst of cataloging problems at the University of California at Los Angeles, he was brought to the Library of Congress in 1943 by Herman Henkle, Director of Processing, to make a special analysis of the Library of Congress's descriptive cataloging practice. The result was *Studies of Descriptive Cataloging: a Report to the Librarian of Congress by the Director of the Processing Department*, which appeared in 1946. Mr. Henkle's study, based on Lubetzky's findings, included statements on the general functions of descriptive cataloging:

1. To distinguish each book from every other book in the library,
2. and to present cataloging data in a manner which will fit in well with other entries in the catalog, and which will be best suited to the needs of most readers.

Principles underlying descriptive cataloging were also covered, including guidance in delimiting terms of description, the extent of description, organization and integration of elements of description, identification of data, and capitalization, in order best to fulfill the general functions as outlined above. In the process of the study, descriptive catalogers tested the value of full title page transcription by the 1908 and 1941 rules as opposed to simplifications in recording data such as the omission of the author's name from the body of the card, condensation of the publisher statement, omission of minor groups of paging, with the conclusion that no bibliographical problems had arisen from these omissions.

The Processing Department's *Study*, together with Lubetzky's "Analysis of Current Descriptive Cataloging Practice" (Appendix E of Study), served as the basis for conferences held by the Director of Processing (Herman Henkle) and the Chief of Descriptive Cataloging (Lucile Morsch) with a select group of library administrators and catalogers during October and

November 1943. The results of these conferences appeared as the *Report of the Advisory Committee on Descriptive Cataloging to the Librarian of Congress*. This *ad hoc* committee expressed approval of Henkle and Lubetzky's analysis of the functions of descriptive cataloging, but expressed some minor reservations on changes and simplified techniques as outlined in the *Study's Principles*. A majority of those catalogers in attendance agreed with the Processing Department *Study's* move away from full bibliographic description; a minority report questioned the wisdom of economies in the cataloging department that might be offset by greater expense in the reference department with the decreased value of the catalog as a bibliographic reference tool.

On the basis of the Advisory Committee's *Report*, the Descriptive Cataloging Division proceeded to draw up a new set of rules for descriptive cataloging. The preliminary edition of these rules was published in June 1947, and circulated to members of the profession outside the Library of Congress for comments and suggestions. Although the rules were specifically designed as a code for guidance of catalogers at the Library of Congress, the analysis of function and the simplification on which the rules were based led the American Library Association in 1949 to recommend that the Library of Congress's *Rules*, with some minor revisions, be adopted as the official code for descriptive cataloging for the American Library Association, to take the place of the much maligned Part II of the 1941 preliminary code.¹⁸

A second edition of Part I, the rules for entry and heading, also appeared in 1949. Responsibility for this revision had been shifted from the ALA's Catalog Code Revision Committee to the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the ALA, and Clara Beetle had been appointed as editor. According to the Preface to the second edition, "chief changes from the preliminary edition [were] a rearrangement of the material to emphasise the basic rules and subordinate their amplifications, . . . reduction of the number of alternate rules, . . . and revision . . . of rules inconsistent with the general principles."¹⁹

Comparison of the two editions of the code for author entry and heading indicates (aside from the omission of descriptive cataloging rules from the 1949 code) few major differences. There are some improvements in arrangement: Choice of main entry (for personal author) is more clearly delineated from rules for form of heading than in the 1941 code. A few directions for descriptive cataloging which had slipped into the rules for author entry (cf 1941, Rule 2: joint author, with its directions for transcribing the names of joint authors in the title) have properly been omitted in the 1949 edition. The 224 rules for entry and heading of the 1941 code have

been reduced (by subdivision, rather than omission) to 158. But in actual length, the two codes are virtually identical: 237 pages in 1941, and 249 (omitting the index in each case) in 1949.

The revised codes for descriptive cataloging and for author headings, "twins by fiat," as Paul S. Dunkin called them,²⁰ were subjected to a variety of criticism when they appeared in 1949. By and large, the Library of Congress *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging* came off better than the ALA *Cataloging Rules*, although enthusiasm for the RDC was on the whole moderate. Leonard Jolley thought that librarians should welcome the new RDC, but he doubted if its use would make for many economies in library cataloging; the new rules were still far too elaborate, and to him the code seemed "a victory for moderate conservatism."²¹ Shera commended the LC decision to allow capitalization of common nouns in German titles, which "at long last permits catalogers to write grammatical German."²² Lubetzky, naturally, commended the revised RDC as "an important victory for progressive cataloging, [one which] marked a change in the philosophy of cataloging from a degenerating *formalism* to a vitalizing *functionalism*."²³

In a similar fashion to the unfavorable comment on the 1941 preliminary edition of the ALA *Rules*, the 1949 edition of *Rules for Authors and Title Entry* was criticized for many failings. It was castigated for its "overlapping and redundant rules, its . . . multiplication of exceptions to rules and even of exceptions to exceptions."²⁴ Despite Clara Beetle's carefully worded statement of principle,²⁵ Jolley accused her and her committee of failure to go back to first principles,²⁶ as well as failure to heed the mandate of ten years' discussion of the cataloging rules advocating simplified cataloging practices.²⁷

And finally, Jesse Shera lumped the two codes together in his critical condemnation of their "failure to recognize seriously the growing problem of complexity." As he saw it, with users of the catalog increasingly unaware of the meaning of most of the information on the cards, "catalogers may find that they are the saber-toothed tigers of librarianship – animals whose failure to adapt themselves to a changing environment become the cause of their own destruction."²⁸

*Seymour Lubetzky's "Cataloging Rules and Principles," the
Proposed Revolution*

On May 15, 1951, Seymour Lubetzky, at this time Technical Assistant to the Director of Processing, received the following memorandum from the Librarian of Congress:

At the request of the DCC Board of Cataloging Policy and Research you are hereby assigned to devote yourself intensively to an analysis of the ALA rules for entry with special reference to the problem of corporate entry, and to prepare a critique of those rules which will point the way for constructive revision.²⁰

Lubetzky's work in the capacity of his new position as Consultant on Bibliography and Cataloging Policy resulted in 1953 in the publication of *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, a slim booklet of sixty-five pages issued by the Processing Department in staid GPO green. But had the book been bound in psychedelic purple, the contents could scarcely have electrified the library world more. In his critique of the ALA rules for entry Lubetzky had succeeded in slashing his way through the legalistic thicket of rules that had alarmed Osborn in 1941, in such a way that he managed in the process to demolish many of the long cherished dogmas of the cataloging kingdom. Is this rule necessary? Is it consistent? asked Lubetzky. And methodically, starting with rule 1 and ending with rule 41 (the section of personal authors), Lubetzky built a devastating framework of improper subordination, illogical reasoning, and misleading examples taken directly from the rules themselves to answer his questions with a resounding "No!"

A second chapter, "The Corporate Complex," takes as its starting point that "an extension of the analysis [of the first part of the critique] would only show that the rules for corporate authors similarly contain many duplicate and parallel rules which could be eliminated, narrow rules which could profitably be combined and replaced by broad rules, and differential rules which are based on unnecessary or irrelevant distinctions and could be discarded."³⁰ In order to show the reason for the present state of illogic, Lubetzky gives the greater part of this chapter to an excellent survey of the history of corporate rules, beginning with Charles Cutter's famous statement, "Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority" from *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog*, 1876. He notes that Cutter, with his "Fifth plan," was the originator of the divergence between societies and institutions which had been one of the chief points of corporate confusion in the rules since that time, and that the reason behind Cutter's distinction, only imperfectly sensed by Cutter, was the "principle that corporate bodies having distinctive or individual names should be entered under their names."³¹ Mortimer Taube's recommendation of entry under name for all corporate bodies³² as a solution to the problem of corporate entry is considered and given tentative approval; Lubetzky closes the chapter with a quotation from Andrew Osborn that unhappily

seemed to sum up the situation: "We have to admit in the first instance that we are not clear in our minds about the fundamental theory of the corporate entry."³³

Chapter Three, "Design for a Code," begins with a statement of *objectives* which a catalog code should fulfil: 1. "To enable the user of the catalog to determine readily whether or not the library has the book he wants . . . [2] To reveal to the user of the catalog, under one form of the author's name, what works the library has by a given author and what editions or translations of a given work."³⁴ Noting that the two objectives sometimes conflict, Lubetzky gives as his solution a return to Panizzi's principle of entry under the form of name as found on the book's title page, whether this be a pseudonym, initials, or an anonymous title. Cross-references can link these varying forms for the collocation of an author's work.³⁵

As primary *bibliographical conditions and principles*, Lubetzky suggests that "books whose authors are known should be entered under their authors and those whose authors are not known should be entered under their titles."³⁶ Complicating these simple principles, Lubetzky notes, is the fact that sometimes "works have more than one author; some authors have more than one name; some works have more than one title, and some works depend for their interest on other works and have no interest of their own."³⁷ The basic principle of entry under the name of the author actually responsible for the content of the work, in the form which he chooses to use in writing the work, still holds. For corporate bodies, the principle is "to enter under the name of the corporate body publications issued in its name — that is, communications purporting to be those of the corporate body and bearing the authority of that body. Other publications should be entered under the person or unit who prepared the work."³⁸ As to form of name, the principle shall be "that bodies having a generic name which is common to many other bodies of the same type in various cities, counties, states, etc. . . . should be entered under the name of the city, county, state, etc., required for their identification . . ." Otherwise enter the corporate body under the shortest and most distinctive form of name which it uses in its publications.³⁹ Noting that a change of corporate name often implies a change in function, Lubetzky suggests that the cataloger "regard a change of name of a corporate body as the end of one body and the beginning of another," and enter works produced by such a body accordingly.⁴⁰ Subdivisions, when they have distinctive names, should be entered directly under their own names.⁴¹

Lubetzky's critique of the ALA *Rules* was greeted with approval on both sides of the Atlantic. Leonard Jolley, long-time critic of the 1949 ALA code, called Lubetzky's work "the definitive expression of the destructive

criticism of a decade."⁴² Marie L. Prevost called it "harbinger of hope."⁴³ Ralph Ellsworth, in a paper presented at a conference held in Los Angeles in 1953 on the Report, seems to have drunk deeply of the heady waters of Lubetzky's fount of knowledge as he asks what surely must be the ultimate question for catalogers: Is it actually necessary for a catalog to be logical?⁴⁴

It was obvious that a new code was in order. The ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification in 1954 delegated Lubetzky to prepare such a code, under the direction of a Steering Committee of the Division. As sections of the rules were worked out by Lubetzky, they were presented for discussion to the Committee.⁴⁵ A "Statement of Objectives and Principles for Catalog Code Revision" was included in the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* in April 1956, giving the framework for the proposed code. The code for author and title entry as outlined, followed Lubetzky's recommendations as given in *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, although on a couple of issues the Committee did not reach complete agreement. Descriptive cataloging rules were to follow in general those already in use.

A partial and tentative draft of the new Code had been completed by 1958, and this was presented at an Institute on Cataloging Code Revision at Stanford University that year.⁴⁶ On the basis of discussion at the Institute and continued revision by the editor and Steering Committee a further draft code was drawn up in 1960. Lubetzky's *Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry, an Unfinished Draft*, was presented at a second Institute on Catalog Code Revision held at Montreal, June 13-17, 1960.

Lubetzky's paper, "Fundamentals of Cataloging," presented at the Montreal Institute, constituted a clear statement of the basic principles of the new code.⁴⁷ Basic among its concepts is the fact that

a book, phonorecord, motion picture, or other material is only a medium through which the work of an author, the product of his mind or skill, is presented; that the same work may be presented through different media; and in each medium by different editions; and that, consequently, the material and the work presented by it are not, and should not be treated as one and the same thing . . . [This] leads to the first fundamental question in cataloging: whether the catalog envisaged is to be a record of the materials in the library, or of the works presented by them or of both? . . . A catalog of books and not of works will often fail or mislead those relying on it . . . [for] a book is normally acquired by a library and sought by its readers because of the work it presents. The proposed revision, therefore, undertakes to concern itself with both, the material cataloged as well as the work pre-

sented by it, and sets forth as its objectives (1) *to facilitate the location of a particular publication, and (2) to relate and bring together the editions of a work and the works of an author.* [Italics mine]⁴⁸

As for the method of achieving this dual objective, Lubetzky suggests that

the basic entry might be used to represent a publication as an edition of a certain work by a certain author, under a particular name of the author and a particular title, with references and added entries used to facilitate the location of a work or an edition issued under another name of the author or under another title . . . [This method] based on the identity of the work and its author, with references or added entries only where necessary to facilitate the location of a particular publication, provides for an economy of entries, a basic entry consistent with and reflective of the tenor of the whole code – which is that a publication represents and should be treated as an edition of a particular work by a particular author.⁴⁹

How is this to be done? Lubetzky agrees that

since a work is normally identified and cited by author and title, it is naturally best represented under author and title in the catalog. If the work is one of complex, changing, or unknown authorship, it is naturally best entered under title only; and if issued under vague or varying titles, it must be entered under the title by which it is best known or under the designation by which it can best be identified . . . The use of “form” headings or subheadings in the main entry was shown to be inconsistent with the respective functions of the main and the added entries and thus detrimental to the organizational pattern of the catalog. The grouping of works by type, form, subject . . . is recognized as a function served by secondary subject entries and is left to these entries in the proposed revision.⁵⁰

In regard to the choice of name for an author who uses various names,

the governing principle is that an author is to be represented in the catalog under the name by which he is most commonly identified in his works, with supplementary rules prescribing the choice of name when he is variously identified. Similarly a work appearing under different titles is entered under the title under which it is most commonly issued . . . [In like manner,] the name of a corporate body, like the title of a work, is entered directly in the form given on the publication.⁵¹

These were the basic fundamentals for the new code. Other speakers at the conference, including Ruth French Strout, Katherine Ball, Arnold Trotier, Bella Schactman, and Maurice F. Tauber discussed and amplified specific areas of the code. A reference librarian, David Watkins of Yale University Library, gave again the age-old plea that catalogers should not shift cost from the cataloging to the reference department by economizing to the extent that the catalog becomes a less efficient reference tool. In particular he was hesitant as to the problems arising if the new rules for corporate entry were to be instituted.⁵² Further problems of adapting the new rules to existing entries in catalogs of large libraries were voiced, but the overwhelming consensus of opinion was in favor of adopting the proposed code, in its entirety.

This was all very well in theory, but how would it work out in practice? A Canadian librarian, Margaret Beckman of the University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, went home from the Montreal Conference determined to find out. Since the University of Waterloo was only three years old, with a library which was being built "from scratch," it seemed to her that her library would be an ideal testing ground for the new code. She began her experiment in July 1960. Working with several thousand books in all areas of the liberal arts, she found that most of Lubetzky's rules for personal authorship were easy to use. Rule 5: Works of Changing Authorship (directories, encyclopedias, etc.) which are to be entered (a) under title or (b) under compiler, depending on the continuity of the editor or compiler's name on the title page, gave trouble because of the difficulty in determining this continuity when handling a new work of this type. Beckman also preferred the traditional use of filing titles to keep together works issued with different titles, which Lubetzky under 7b to 8 wishes to enter under the author's name with a bracketed "uniform title" as a gathering device. (cf. AACR Chapter 4) But on the whole she felt that her experiment in using Lubetzky's new code had been highly successful.⁵³

But as the glow from the Montreal Conference subsided, a few dissenting voices made themselves heard. Johannes L. Dewton, as Head of the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress, had ample opportunity to gauge the degree of bibliographical uniformity produced by cooperating libraries working with the prescriptive 1949 ALA Rules. Speaking against the proposed code, he based his arguments on a group of "howlers," examples of execrably bad cataloging actually taken from the NUC files. What the profession needed, argued Dewton, was even more precise rules and clear standards rather than a code based on an abstract philosophy of "logical" entry and permissiveness.⁵⁴ David Watkins repeated his plea for consideration of the reference value of the card catalog which he had given

at the Montreal Conference.⁵⁵ And Eric L. Moon, editor of *Library Journal*, who had spearheaded the issue of *LJ* in which these dissenting voices had been heard, queried tongue-in-cheek, "Who Cares about the Code?" As he put it, the question before the profession was, should the new code provide rigid rules to cover every contingency, or should the rules be based on a set of "unifying principles?" Opposition to the code, he felt, came from those who felt that the cataloger should not have to exercise any judgment. (And parenthetically, he added, from what he had seen, he agreed that catalogers by and large should avoid exercising judgment).⁵⁶

The defenders of the new code were given their day in court in the September 1, 1961 issue of *Library Journal*. Lubetzky gave an impassioned statement of the state of the cataloging rules that had led to the new code. As he put it,

Our national code (1949) has deteriorated into an incoherent mass of rules defying any rational comprehension; our catalogs have deteriorated into perplexing masses of cards; the work of cataloging has deteriorated into an irrational activity shunned by all who can escape it. The time has come for a fundamental re-examination of the problems, objectives, principles, and methods of cataloging, and for the reconstruction of our code in accordance with recognized objectives, principles, and methods.⁵⁷

Paul Dunkin, a second witness for the defense, claimed, with considerable logic, that Mr. Dewton's "howlers" did not involve a code of rules, but rather lack of knowledge and judgment on the part of some catalogers. What Mr. Dewton has proved, says Dunkin, is that sometimes stupid uneducated people become catalogers. But is it just barely possible, he queries innocently, that some of these stupid people also become reference librarians? Possibly the solution, he suggests, is an extension of Cataloging in Source, or the "Cards with Books" plan, to upgrade the quality of cataloging done in American libraries.⁵⁸

*The International Conference on Cataloging Principles, Paris 1961:
the Triumph of Lubetzky's Principles*

But despite ripples of discontent on the home front, Lubetzky's *Code of Cataloging Rules* was yet to see its greatest triumph. The International Federation of Library Associations' working group on the Coordination of Cataloguing Rules (later the Committee on Uniform Cataloguing Rules) had taken part in the Montreal Conference at which Lubetzky's *Code*

had been presented, discussed, and approved. The IFLA Committee decided to adopt the *Code* as the basis for a draft statement of principles for a possible international code of cataloging to be presented at a conference in Paris the following year.

This conference, the International Conference on Cataloging Principles, held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris, October 9–18, 1961, was without doubt the most significant accomplishment to date in the movement for cooperation, both national and international, between libraries. Its objective was simple, but most difficult of achievement: to reach international agreement on rules for author and title entry in alphabetical catalogs in order that cataloging might be undertaken in the country where the books are originally published, and the resultant cataloging entries used by libraries all over the world.⁵⁹ Delegates, limited to one hundred, were chosen from national and regional library associations, international library associations, national libraries, national union catalogs, and government organizations for the control of libraries. All delegates received well in advance of the time of the conference a draft statement of principles, based on Lubetzky's 1960 *Code*, for study. Working papers given at the conference were also circulated to delegates, with an invitation for them to comment both in writing and from the floor.⁶⁰

American delegates included Wyllis E. Wright, chairman of the ALA Code Revision Committee, Richard S. Angell, Sumner Spalding, Paul Dunkin, Ruth Eisenart, C. D. Gull, Seymour Lubetzky, and Werner B. Ellinger.⁶¹ Lubetzky, Dunkin, and Eisenart presented papers; other papers, all of them discussing particular aspects of Lubetzky's *Code*, were given by delegates from Yugoslavia, West Germany, France, Russia, Great Britain, and Canada, each presenting differing point of view reflecting national cataloging practices.⁶²

After discussion of the formal papers, delegates accepted the draft code, by now crystallized into a formal twelve point "Statement of Principles," virtually unanimously. This easy resolution of cataloging differences as firmly entrenched, for instance, as the differences in corporate practice between the Prussian and the Anglo-American traditions surprised and almost disappointed many delegates; Leonard Jolley felt that it showed a regrettable lack of originality, considering the large body of catalogers assembled from differing national backgrounds and traditions.⁶³

The "Statement of Principles,"⁶⁴ familiarly known as "Paris Principles," is intimately related to Lubetzky's 1960 *Code of Cataloging Rules*. Both assume that the functions of the catalog are primarily that of a finding list: to show "whether the library contains a particular book," (PP2:1) and secondarily, that of collocation: to show "which works by a particular

author and which editions of a particular work are in the library." (PP2:2) Both prescribe entry of the author (either personal or corporate) under "the most frequently used name . . . or title appearing in editions of the works cataloged . . ." (PP7) Entry word for personal names is, both in CCR and Paris Principles, "determined so far as possible by agreed usage in the country of which the author is a citizen." (PP 12)

Section 9 of the Paris Principles deals with entry under corporate bodies. This section, calling for entry under corporate body "when the work is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body . . . (9.1), or, when the wording of the title or title page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work," (9.2) found agreement among delegates even in the German camp.⁸⁵ Paris Principle 9.4, entry of the corporate body under "the name by which the body is most frequently identified in its publications," a fundamental consideration in Lubetzky's cataloging theory from the 1953 *Report* to the 1960 *Code*, was accepted almost as a matter of course by all present, including all members of the United States delegation.

Serpent in Eden: Lubetzky vs. LC-ARL

Delegates from countries represented at the IFLA Conference returned to their homes filled with enthusiasm for the cause of international uniformity in library cataloging. A ground-swell of interest in code revision was rising, and under the influence of the Paris Principles a new Spanish code was issued in 1964, a Bulgarian code in 1962, East and West German codes in 1965, and a partial French code in 1963.⁸⁶ British interest in a revision of the 1908 Anglo-American code had already resulted in joint U. S.-British agreement on an attempt to formulate a second Anglo-American code, this time based on Lubetzky's principles of 1953, his code of 1960, and the Paris Principles of 1961. British enthusiasm for Lubetzky's reforms and for the criteria of the Paris Principles and the 1960 code was (and is) great.

But at home in the United States, Melvil Dewey once more voiced his conservative distrust of the winds of change blowing through the cataloging world. The following appeared in *Library Journal*, June 1, 1964:

The card catalog is the worst place in the world to make new changes, because new work is inserted at irregular places, destroying consistency and harmony, and reflecting unpleasantly on the ability of those who have done the work . . . No librarian with much respect for his

catalog will consent to continual change in his rules, even if he is anxious to keep in harmony with ALA Committees, library schools, and the practice of printed cards.

... No changes are to be made without overwhelming evidence that the change is not only an improvement, but a great enough improvement, to justify its cost and the inevitable confusion that must result from it...

... The American tendency ... to run after alleged improvements is particularly dangerous in our cataloging world.⁶⁷

And Dewey, addressing himself originally to those innovators who were drawing up the first Anglo-American code of 1908, seemed to speak again for the increasing concern of the large research libraries in regard to the cost of implimenting some of the pending changes in the proposed second Anglo-American code. How much recataloging would the new rules, particularly those for entry of all corporate bodies under name, mean to the large library? And how much time would be lost while libraries all over the country retrained their catalogers in the use of a new set of rules?

Early in 1962, the Library of Congress made a study of the extent to which its catalogs would need to be changed if the proposed code were to be applied retrospectively. The results were discouraging.⁶⁸ Supported by the Association of Research Libraries, the Library of Congress voiced its objections to the cost of wholesale change to the Catalog Code Revision Committee at the Miami Conference of the American Library Association, summer 1962. The so-called "Miami compromise" resulted, marking the first real hiatus between the British and American committees on the Anglo-American code.⁶⁹ Most particularly affected was the section of the code based on Paris Principle 9.4, "The uniform heading for works entered under the name of a corporate body should be the name by which the body is ... identified."

In the battle that followed, Seymour Lubetzky resigned as editor of the new Code, Sumner Spalding of the Library of Congress was chosen to take his place, and AACR Rules 98 and 99 were drawn up as special exceptions to the general rule for the entry of corporate bodies. Under these rules, local churches and "certain other corporate bodies," i. e. educational institutions, libraries, galleries, museums, agricultural experiment stations, airports, botanical and zoological gardens, and hospitals -- Cutter's old familiar list from his "fifth plan" -- Cutter's old familiar list from his "fifth plan" -- were under certain carefully specified conditions to be entered under place.⁷⁰

The British Cataloguing Rules Sub-Committee refused to accept this partial return to the ALA *Rules* of 1949, preferring to follow the entry principle as outlined in the Paris Principles of 1961. Nor were the British willing to accept the re-introduction of the hybrid "form" headings so forcefully protested by Lubetzky in his research and commentary on the rules. The present British edition of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* has not accept AACR 23, 24, 25, rules for the entry of court rules ("enter court rules under the name of the jurisdiction . . . followed by the sub-heading *Court rules* . . .") and for treaties, a complex rule with numerous conditions attached to its implimentation.

After the Miami compromise of 1962, five more years of meetings and work ensued. At length the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* were published, in the spring of 1967. The sections dealing with entry and heading were, as an embodiment of the Paris Principles of 1961, in many respects radically different from their predecessors in the 1949 ALA *Rules*. But rules for description had not been discussed at the Paris Conference. Part II, "Rules for Description," remained, in the North American text, virtually unchanged from the 1949 Library of Congress *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging*.

Meanwhile, the International Federation of Library Associations, sponsor of the Paris Conference, set up a Committee on Cataloguing to consider further problems in cataloging relating to international uniformity. An obvious area for consideration was bibliographical description. The Library of Congress had begun its National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC), otherwise known as the Shared Cataloging Program, in 1966. Under the terms of this program, the Library of Congress agreed to use bibliographical description prepared in foreign countries for material originating in these countries in making Library of Congress card copy. The Shared Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress revised the main entry to agree with rules affecting entry in the Library of Congress catalogs, but used the descriptive cataloging as it was received. The use of these cards with all of their variations from our customary style has emphasised the need of coming to some sort of international agreement on bibliographical format.

A further factor in the push for international unification of cataloging data is the increased use of automation in libraries. Catalog cards must include machine readable elements, and these must be uniform in all countries from which we wish to receive material, if automation is to be exploited to its fullest. With these two provisos in mind, the International Federation of Library Associations sponsored an International Meeting of Cataloguing

Experts in Copenhagen, August 22–24, 1969, where possibilities for further international cooperation in cataloging were explored. From this meeting came a statement of policy:

Efforts should be directed towards creating a system for the international exchange of information by which the standard bibliographical description of each publication would be established and distributed by a national agency in the country of origin of the publication. The means of distribution in such a system would be through the medium of cards or machine readable records. The effectiveness of the system will be dependent upon the maximum standardization of the form and content of the bibliographical description.⁷¹

To implement this policy a Working Group on an International Standard Bibliographical Description was established, committed to develop a pattern of bibliographic description which would be acceptable for use in all national bibliographies, and which would make use of symbols which could be programmed for machine reading. The Group's efforts culminated in 1971 in the preliminary edition of what has since then become a familiar acronym in the library world: *ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Single Volume and Multi-Volume Monographic Publications* (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloguing). This document, revised by an international committee in Grenoble, August 23–24, 1973, and presented as a First Standard Edition in 1974,⁷² has been adopted, more or less in total, by most of the countries whose catalog codes are based on the Paris Principles. Anglo-American cataloging was brought into line with *ISBD(M)* stipulations with the revision of AACR Chapter 6 (Description of Separately Published Monographs) in the summer of 1974; the Library of Congress adopted the new code for the descriptive cataloging of monographs in September 1974.

Briefly, the purpose of International Standard Bibliographic Description (which by the way has nothing to do with choice or form of entry) is

to facilitate the international exchange of bibliographic information, whether in written or machine-readable form, by standardizing the elements to be used in the bibliographic description of monographs, assigning an order to these elements in the entry, and specifying a system of symbols to be used in punctuating these elements . . . The elements of the description and their order of presentation are not markedly different from those specified in the [1967 AACR] Chapter 6. The two major changes resulting from the *ISBD* are the introduction of a system of formal punctuation and the requirement for an author

statement following the title information. The standard punctuation will permit quick identification of the elements even by the catalog user who is totally unfamiliar with the language of the description. To accomplish this the prescribed punctuation will be used in all cases . . .⁷⁸

One further important stipulation of ISBD(M) is the inclusion in the catalog entry, when available, of the International Standard Book Number (ISBN). This is a definitive element of identification for books published after 1968.

Efforts of the IFLA Committee on Serial Publications to standardize rules for the description of serials led to the establishment in 1971 of a Joint Working Group on the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials, at the IFLA General Council held in Liverpool. The result of the group's deliberations was a second international standard for bibliographic description: *ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials* (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1974). In many ways, ISBD(S) is, as it was meant to be, a close parallel to ISBD(M). Like the ISBD(M), ISBD(S) specifies items which are necessary for the identification of serials and prescribes the order and punctuation of these elements as they will appear in the catalog entry. As with ISBD(M), the use of prescribed punctuation and order of elements will facilitate the use of cataloging information on the international level and will aid catalogers and library users who may not be familiar with the language of the bibliographic description. As a parallel to the inclusion of ISBN as a part of the catalog data for monographs, International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), a unique identification for serials, is to be recorded where available.

Following the publication of ISBD(S) in 1974, an ISBD(S) Revision Meeting was held in Paris in October 1975. Agreements and revisions resulting from this meeting will be embodied in the First Standard Edition of ISBD(S), which is expected to form the basis of the revised AACR Chapter 7, "Serials," to be included in the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*.

The proliferation of committees devoted to the development of rules for the international standard bibliographic description of such varied types of materials as maps, non-book materials, "old books" (books printed prior to 1820), and music led, logically, to the formation of an IFLA committee for a Generalized International Standard for Bibliographic Description (ISBD (G)), and to the publication of a generalized standard for descriptive cataloging. This new standard, it must be emphasized, is not a code of rules in itself; it is a framework within which national and international codes for the descriptive cataloging of various types of material must be built.

Existing ISBD's, where they vary from the general pattern, will be changed to agree with it. The Joint Steering Committee for the second edition of the Anglo-American Code has agreed in principle to the use of ISBD(G) as the standard for descriptive cataloging rules for all types of material covered by the AACR.⁷⁴

A further result of the 1969 Copenhagen meeting of cataloging experts was the establishment, on July 1, 1974, of the IFLA Office for Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC), directed by Dorothy Anderson and housed in the British Library, London. This program was set up "to benefit international bibliographic exchange by improving national bibliographic control".⁷⁵ The ultimate aim of the UBC office will be the promulgation of an internationally acceptable cataloging code.

Is it possible that the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* might ultimately be adopted as that code? At the Anglo-Nordic Seminar on the Revision and International Use of AACR, held in York, England, April 11-14, 1975, this question was discussed.⁷⁶ Not only is the Anglo-American code widely used in English speaking countries which have an Anglo-American library tradition; it has also been translated into many languages and is used, as a whole or in part, in countries as diverse as Korea and Guyana.⁷⁷ However, it has been criticized on the international level for a number of reasons. In the first place, the complex "legalese" in which the text is written forms a stumbling block to understanding even more for foreign users than it does for English speaking librarians. Further, AACR preference for English forms of personal and geographic names (see, for example, AACR rules 44A3a and 72A) is unacceptable on the international level. Although with the re-writing of AACR rules 4 and 5 and the deletion of rules 98 and 99, the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* have come closer to conformity with the Paris Principles of 1961, the code is still criticised for its deviations from this standard, notably in its use of form subheadings for legal and liturgical publications, and in its entry of serials under corporate bodies. AACR treatment of corporate bodies in general differs in many respects from that preferred by cataloging experts in other parts of the world. Anglo-American practice calls for many more entries under corporate author than would be internationally acceptable.⁷⁸

How does the revised second edition of the *Anglo American Cataloging Rules* meet these criticisms? American revision of the 1967 AACR was carried forth informally through announcements in the *Library of Congress Cataloging Service Bulletin* beginning in September 1967 (Bulletin 81). Further revision was officially designated as the responsibility of the newly formed ALA RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) at the American Library Association's Midwinter meeting, 1974. In March 1974

a joint United States-British-Canadian cataloging meeting held in Chicago set up a Joint Steering Committee for the implementation of the second edition of the AACR. This Joint Steering Committee has agreed that the new edition will "provide a definitive national and international standard for entry for any one work, be it monograph or serial, . . . and [that it will] facilitate the conversion of bibliographic information to machine-readable form."⁷⁹

As libraries enter a new era in which computers may cease to be used only for the production of catalog cards, and may instead be used on-line as the catalog index to the collection itself, the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* is already under fire by critics.⁸⁰ It seems evident already that the second edition of the AACR, far from being the termination of the quest for international unity in cataloging, is still but an intermediate way station on the route to that goal.

FOOTNOTES

1. Charles C. Jewett, *Smithsonian Report 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* (Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1852).
2. Boston Athenaeum, *Catalogue of the Library of the Boston Athenaeum, 1807-1871* (Boston, 1874-1882), v. 5, p. 3402.
3. Charles A. Cutter, *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue* (U.S. Bureau of Education. Public Libraries in the United States of America, p. 2) (Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1876), p. 5.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
5. American Library Association, *Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries*, compiled by committees of the American Library Association and the (British) Library Association. American ed. (Chicago, 1908).
6. *Ibid.*, p. viii.
7. J. C. M. Hanson, *The Anglo-American Agreement on Cataloging Rules and its bearing on International Cooperation in Cataloging of Books* (Brussels, 1908), p. 7.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
9. J. C. M. Hanson, "Revision of ALA Cataloging Rules," *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook*, no. 3 (1932), 7-19.
10. American Library Association, *Catalog Code Revision Committee. A.L.A. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries*. Preliminary American ed. (Chicago, American Library Association, 1941), p. viii. (Hereafter referred to as 1941 code).
11. *Library Journal*, LXI (Apr. 15, 1936), 306-08.
12. 1941 Code, pp. ix-x.
13. *Ibid.*, p. xii.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, p. viii.
16. Osborn, "The Crisis in Cataloging," in R. K. Olding, ed. *Readings in Library Cataloguing* (Melbourne, F. W. Cheshire, 1966), p. 229.

17. As for instance Wyllis E. Wright, "Cataloging Crisis," *Library Journal*, LXVI (Dec. 15, 1941), 1086. Wright questions how far we can restrict the rules, reminding Osborn that the new code was built upon actual cataloging problems (and thus should qualify as pragmatic).
18. Library of Congress. *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress* (Adopted by the American Library Association). (Washington, 1949), p. 5. Hereafter cited as RDC.
19. American Library Association. Division of Cataloging and Classification. *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries*. 2d ed. (Chicago, American Library Association, 1949), p. ix. Hereafter cited as 1949 code.
20. "Criticisms of Current Cataloging Practice," in Ruth French Strout, ed., *Toward a Better Cataloging Code* (Chicago, University of Chicago, Graduate Library School, 1957), p. 38.
21. "Some Recent Developments in Cataloging in the United States of America," *Journal of Documentation*, VI (June 1950), 76.
22. J. H. Shera, "Review of 1949 Codes," *Library Quarterly*, XX (Apr. 1950), 149.
23. "Development of Cataloging Rules," *Library Trends*, II (Oct. 1953), 183.
24. L. Jolley, *The Principles of Cataloguing* (New York, Philosophical Library, 1961), p. 3.
25. "The principle on which the cataloging is planned is the use as main entry of the author, personal or corporate, considered to be chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the work. Thus the finding list function of the catalog is extended beyond what is required for location of a single book to the location of literary units about which the seeker has less precise information. Added entries provide alternative means of approach . . . [and] serve also to complete the assembling of related material as part of a literary unit." 1949 code, p. xx.
26. Jolley, "Some Recent Developments . . .," p. 76. He expresses the same thought in his *Principles of Cataloguing*, p. 3.
27. Jolley, "Some Recent Developments . . .," p. 77.
28. Shera, p. 150.
29. Quoted in Benjamin A. Custer, "Seymour Lubetzky," *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, XII (Jan. 1956), 6.
30. Seymour Lubetzky, *Cataloging Rules and Principles* (Washington, Processing Dept., Library of Congress, 1953), p. 16.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
32. Mortimer Taube, "The Cataloging of Publications of Corporate Authors," *Library Quarterly*, XX (Jan. 1950), 1-20.
33. Andrew Osborn, "Cataloging Developments in the United States, 1940-1947," *Actes du Comite International des bibliothèques*, 13me sess., Oslo, 1947, p. 71, quoted in *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, p. 35.
34. *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, p. 36. Note that this is identical in intent with Cutter's "Objectives" as stated in *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*, almost to the very words. Lubetzky's 1960 code gives a similarly worded dual set of objectives with the minor exception of the substitution of the word "work" for "book." Paul Dunkin indicates that Lubetzky's reason for doing this is that the user of the catalog is generally content with any version of a work, regardless of which book it appears in. (Paul Dunkin, "Cutter Redivivus," *Libri*, XI, no. 2 (1961), 182.)
35. *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, p. 38-39.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
42. Leonard Jolley, "Review of Seymour Lubetzky's Cataloging Rules and Principles," *Journal of Documentation*, X (June 1954), 78.
43. Marie L. Prevost, "Lubetzky Report: Harbinger of Hope," *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, X (Apr. 1954), 73-76.
44. Ralph Ellsworth, "Notes on the Lubetzky Report," in "ALA Rules for Entry: The Proposed Revolution!" *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, IX (Sept. 1953), 123-142.
45. Dunkin, "Cutter Redivivus," p. 161.
46. Seymour Lubetzky, *Code of Cataloging Rules: Bibliographic Entry and Description, a Partial and Tentative Draft*. [n.p.] 1958.
47. "Fundamentals of Cataloging," Institute on Catalog Code Revision, McGill University, 1960, *Working Papers*, no. 2. Chicago, 1960. This was an amplification of the Introduction (p. ix-xv) of Lubetzky's 1960 Cataloging code.
48. "Fundamental of Cataloging," p. 2.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 2-3. Cf. also Seymour Lubetzky, *Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry, an Unfinished Draft ...* (Chicago, American Library Association, 1960) (hereafter referred to as CCR), Rule 7b, and *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules ... North American Text* (Chicago, American Library Association, 1967), (Hereafter referred to as AACR), Chapter 4: Uniform Titles.
50. "Fundamentals of Cataloging," p. 3. Cf. CCR 42. Not included in AACR.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
52. David R. Watkins, "A Reference Librarian Looks at the Proposed Catalog Code," Institute on Catalog Code Revision, McGill University, 1960, *Working Papers*, no. 9. Chicago, 1960.
53. Margaret Beckman, "Experiment in the Use of the Revised Code of Cataloging Rules," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, V (Summer 1961), 216-220.
54. Johannes L. Dewton, "The Grand Illusion," *Library Journal*, LXXXVI (May 1, 1961), 1719-29.
55. Watkins, "A Reference Librarian's View of the Draft Code," *Library Journal*, LXXXVI (May 1, 1961), 1730-33.
56. Eric L. Moon, "Who Cares About the Code?" *Ibid.*, p. 1744.
57. "Smoke Over Revision," *Library Journal*, LXXXVI (Sept. 1, 1961), 2740-44.
58. Paul S. Dunkin, "Howlers - Here and Now," *Ibid.*, pp. 2744-49.
59. International Conference on Cataloging Principles, Paris, 1961. *Report*. London, 1963. Introduction, p. 1.
60. A. H. Chaplin, "International Conference on Cataloging Principles: Organization," *Journal of Documentation*, XIX (June 1963), 41-46.
61. Katherine Ball, "The Paris Conference," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, VI (Spring 1962), 172.
62. Papers are presented in their entirety in International Conference ... *Report* (op. cit.). Leonard Jolley summarizes the contents of the papers in his "International Conference on Cataloging Principles: Thoughts after Paris," *Journal of Documentation*, XIX (June 1963), 47-62.
63. "International Conference ... Thoughts after Paris," *ibid.*, p. 47.

64. International Conference on Cataloging Principles, Paris, 1961. *Statement of Principles*. This has been reprinted in a number of different journals, among them *Library Resources and Technical Services*, VI (Spring 1962), 162-170; Mary Piggot, "IFLA International Conference on Cataloguing Principles," *Library Association Record*, LXIV (Apr. 1962), 133-142; also International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, 1961. *Statement of Principles*. Annotated ed., with commentary and examples by Eva Verona. (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971).
65. Note that the present West German rule for corporate entry is based on the criterion of Paris Principle 9.2.
66. A. H. Chaplin, "Cataloguing Principles: Five Years after the Paris Conference," *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries*, XXI (May-June 1967), 140-145.
67. Melvil Dewey, "Changing Catalog Rules," *Library Journal*, LXXXIX (June 1, 1964), 2296. Originally in July 1902 *Library Journal*.
68. Elizabeth L. Tate, "Main Entries and Citations: One Test of the Revised Catalog Code," *Library Quarterly*, XXXIII (April 1963), 172-191.
69. Paul S. Dunkin, "Catalog Code Revision," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, VII (Spring 1963), 207.
70. AACR rule 98 was substantially changed and rule 99 was cancelled in May 1974 (*Cataloging Service Bulletin* 109), thus bringing the North American text of the AACR into closer conformity with the British text.
71. International Federation of Library Associations, "Report of the International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts, Copenhagen, 1969," *Libri*, XX, no. 1-2 (1970), 115-116.
72. International Federation of Library Associations, *ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications* (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1974).
73. Library of Congress, *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, 105 (November 1972).
74. *ISBD(G): International Standard Bibliographic Description (General); the Annotated Text of the General Framework for the Description of All Library Materials* (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, April 1976). Provisions of ISBD(G) were discussed at a special meeting of the American Library Association's Catalog Code Revision Committee on July 18, 1976 in Chicago.
75. Dorothy Anderson, "The Future of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) in the Light of Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC)," *LRTS*, XX, no. 1 (Winter 1976), 4.
76. "Anglo-Nordic Seminar on the Revision and International Use of AACR, York, 1975," *Catalogue & Index*, no. 37 (Summer 1975), 1-2, 8-9.
77. Dorothy Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
78. Eva Verona, *Corporate Headings: their use in Library Catalogues and National Bibliographies* (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1975).
79. Neal L. Edgar, "What Every Librarian Should Know about Proposed Changes in Cataloging Rules," *American Libraries*, VI, no. 10 (Nov. 1975), 605.
80. As for instance, M. Nabil Hamdy, *The Concept of Main Entry as Represented in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, 1973).