



Results of the code comparisons: a summary **Prepared by Dr. Barbara Tillett**

Some time before the expert meeting in Frankfurt the current European rule making bodies had been asked to prepare a paper on the approach taken in their code for the special topics of focus for the conference. Eighteen reports¹ have been given, all of them indicating that their rules are based on the Paris Principles² for choice and form of headings and entry words.

Many noted that the Paris Principles were written for card catalogues or manual catalogues with a single alphabetical file for the bibliographic records and added entries and reference cards, whereas today, most online catalogues manipulate bibliographic records and index points to allow retrieval and display of full bibliographic records or brief displays of selected elements from the bibliographic record in addition to providing references from variant forms to authorized forms of headings.

According to the Paris Principle 2 the catalogue should be an efficient instrument to ascertain whether the library contains a particular book by author and title or by title alone or by a title substitute as well as to ascertain which books by a particular author and which editions of a particular work are in the library.

Survey response regarding the functions of the catalogue still indicates focus on the finding and collocating functions. An exception was noted in the German/Austrian response where their rules do not prescribe differentiation of a name of a person, so they would be unable to collocate works of a particular author when more than one person has the same name. Another variation here is the recognition of "bibliographic identities" as separate entities that may correspond to one or more actual persons or corporate bodies. In the role of author, a person or corporate body may have one or more bibliographic identities and separate authority records for those controlled names would be created.

For the structure of the catalogue most respondents indicated agreement with the Paris Principle 3, creating one single bibliographic record for each book and making added entries in some cases. An exception was noted that Bulgarian rules do not make added entries for additional authors or variant titles.

The Paris Principle 4 lists three kinds of entries: main entry, added entries and references. The cataloguing codes currently recognize these kinds of entries, i. e., possible records in a catalogue. Additionally, several codes also distinguish among the types of reference records as: See reference records, see also reference records, general explanatory records as the IFLA Guidelines for authority records and references (GARR)³ also recommends. In all cases the "main entry" is viewed as the full bibliographic record. Through the online discussion⁴ it was also clear that people are eager to move away from the term "main entry" and to use a more precise and up to date term. Perhaps when we mean the full bibliographic record, we should use the term "bibliographic record".

As for the use of Multiple Entries Paris Principle 5 says: "The two functions of the catalogue are most effectively discharged by an entry for each book under a heading derived from the author's name or from the title as printed in the book, and when variant forms of the author's name or of the title occur, an entry for each book under a uniform heading, consisting of one



particular form of the author's name or one particular title, or, for books not identified by author or title, a uniform heading consisting of a suitable substitute for the title, and appropriate added entries and/or references." Survey respondents indicated agreement with Paris Principles on this issue, but the AFNOR response also indicated that they use the geographic name heading as the main entry heading for cartographic materials. The AFNOR response also indicated they would never provide a uniform title main entry heading if the book could not be identified by author or title. Whereas, the response from the Netherlands indicate uniform titles are mandatory only for anonymous classics, including the Bible and for printed music and recordings of classical music.

The AFNOR response also indicates variations for added entries in that title headings are not mandatory. Uniform titles are established for sacred scriptures, anonymous classics, works of authors abundantly published, and graphic variant forms of antiquaria. They use "form titles" for exhibition catalogues, sales catalogues, festschrifts, and treaties.

It is also common to use authority records to document the variant forms of names and titles, which then appear in online catalogues as references.

Principle 6 refers to the functions of different kinds of entries and suggests that an entry under an author's name should normally be made under a uniform heading for that author's name. It is also said that the other names or forms of name should normally be references but added entries may be used in special cases.

Most rules today put the form of author's name as printed on the book in the area 1 of description and use that form as either the authorized form or a variant form in an authority record.

With regard to the special cases of using added entries in place of references, such as when a particular work is associated with a particular name, the Italian rules do not provide such added entries. The Russian rules provide for this through their authority records. In fact, that is probably most likely in most countries today using online systems. The authority records contain the variant forms and other names and those are then used in the online catalogue as references to the authorized forms.

Likewise for other titles of the same work, they are typically managed as cross-references in the title or name/title authority record. Added entries for different titles are not typically made in the bibliographic record, if there is an authority record for the uniform title (title or name/title).

The title proper is given as an access point in the bibliographic record, but the other variant titles when using a uniform title are given in authority records.

The older Hungarian rules did not provide title access when the main entry heading was an author.

For choice of the uniform heading the Paris Principles suggest the most frequently used name or title in editions of the works catalogued or in references by accepted authorities. In case of multiple languages it is recommended to prefer original language or form found in editions or references in languages of the catalogue. The codes basically follow this principle.



According to principle 8.1 “the main entry for every edition of a work ascertained to be by a single personal author should be made under the author’s name. An added entry or reference should be made under the title or each edition in which the author’s name is not stated on the title-page.” In case of multiple languages it is also suggested to prefer original language or form found in editions or references in languages of the catalogue. “The uniform heading should be the name by which the author is most frequently identified in editions of his works, in the fullest form commonly appearing there, except that another name or form of name should be taken as the uniform heading if it has become established in general usage either in references to the author in biographical, historical and literary works, or in relation to his public activities other than authorship. A further identifying characteristic should be added, if necessary, to distinguish the author from others of the same name.”

The codes agree on using the form found. The French rules choose the best-known name after an author’s death when different pseudonyms are used. Regarding the further identifying characteristics, the Vatican rules make additions beyond AACR2 for names related to religious entities. Czech rules use more identifying characteristics than AACR2 when the cataloguer has the information, not only to differentiate names. On the other hand, the German rules do not prescribe to differentiation of names of a person (but this practice is subject to change).

Most codes follow the rule “Use a main entry heading for corporate body when the work is an expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body, even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body and 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“. However, in the Netherlands corporate main entry is never made, but an access point, added entry is given when the corporate body is responsible for the content of a work. They make an exception for a performing group in sound recordings. The PPIAK rules used in Croatia do not follow corporate entry for serials, but do for monographs. The Spanish rules are more restrictive in the idea of “activity” of when to use a corporate body as the primary heading. Finnish rules prefer the main entry heading be the key title or title proper with an added entry for the corporate body for serials whose titles consist of generic terms, even when they are the activity of a corporate body.

Also followed by most codes is the rule “In other cases when a corporate body has performed a function (such as that of an editor) subsidiary to the function of the author, an added entry should be made under the name of the corporate body”. The principle “In doubtful cases, the main entry (heading) may be made under the name of the corporate body or under the title of the name of the personal author, with an added entry in either case under the alternative not chosen for the main entry“ is followed uniquely by all codes.

Regarding the form of the name all codes follow the principle to prefer the name most frequently used by the corporate body in its publications with its exceptions. However, the Czech prefer to follow the form found in authority files or national bibliographies when possible to derive the most frequently identified form. Similarly when there are many forms, the AFNOR rules in France also use other sources such as national authority files and reference sources. The Spanish rules also prefer a conventional name over an official form. Regarding multiple languages, the PPIAK (Croatia) use the name in the first official language used in the library catalogue. The Netherlands’ rules do not apply the exception of preferring the form most commonly used in the publication in the country of origin or in standard



reference works, but as a last resort the most recent form. Finland prefers to use the Finnish and Swedish forms, as they have two official languages.

There are more exceptions: to prefer for states and other territorial authorities the currently used form of name of the territory in the language of the users of the catalogue, to make a successive entry when the name change is not minor and connect names by references, and to add a further identifying characteristic to distinguish corporate bodies with the same name. The past practice in some countries was to assemble all the names under the latest name or one name and to use a grouping authority record to bring them together, but more recent rules follow the successive entry practice. An exception is PPIAK for Croatia which does not follow this practice. The addition of further identifying characteristics is common practice in all rules.

According to principle 9 constitutions, laws and treaties, and certain other works having similar characteristics, should be entered under the name of the appropriate territorial authority, with formal or conventional titles indicating the nature of material. Added entries for actual titles (titles proper) should be made as needed. Most rules agree in this principle, but the German RAK rules do not apply for laws, preferring instead a title entry with a uniform title, which is the official title of the law. In the Netherlands the main entry heading is the title proper; in the Finnish rules this kind of publication is entered mainly under the title. It would certainly be important to agree at least that in future international rules there should be an access point for the territorial authority and a uniform title, as well as access through the title proper.

All rules agree that for entries of subordinate bodies, the name of the subordinate body should be preferred directly, except if the name implies subordination or a subordinate function or is insufficient to identify; then it should be preferred a heading starting with the superior body and the subordinate body's name as a subheading. Also most rules agree that there is made an exception, if the subordinate body is an administrative, judicial, or legislative organ of a government; then the cataloguer should prefer the uniform heading starting with the territorial authority with the name of the organ as a subheading. Only the Netherlands give the territorial name as a qualifier or otherwise when the superior body is not named on the publication or it is not clear that a territorial body is involved, they prefer the name given on the publication.

Principle 10 refers to multiple authorship. When two or more authors have shared in the creation of a work, the main entry should be made under the name of the principal author, if there is one represented as such. If there is none represented a principal, the main entry should be made under the first name on the title-page - with added entries for the second and third when present and no more than three. If there are four or more authors the main entry should be made under the title of the work with added entries for the first named author and as many others as necessary. Most of the rules agree in this principle, but the Netherlands consider corporate bodies to be a group of more than three personal authors, so a work that has both a personal author and a corporate author is entered under title with added entries for the personal author and the corporate author. When there are more than three personal authors, the AFNOR rules in France add the stipulation of names with the same type of function. Usually when there are more than three, no access points are made for them, but the rules do not forbid libraries from increasing the number in their own catalogues. For video recordings, AFNOR does not recognize the idea of principal author, as the work is always considered a collective work with main entry under title proper and a



limited number of additional access points. In the SuDoc (Superintendent of Documents classification system) the film director is considered the main author.

When there is a collection to be recorded, i.e. independent works or parts of works by different authors, the entry should be made under the title of the collection, if it has a collective title, or under the name of the author or the title of the first work, if there is no collective title. In both cases added entries should be made under the name of the compiler, if it is known. As an exception the entry should be made under the compiler's name, if it appears prominently with title added entry.

Interestingly, no one of the rules uses the minority text or the exception. This main text is that used in the codes responding to the survey.

The response from Macedonia was that they do not follow this principle for collections because the title of the collection is part of the record and is given at the end of the record in brackets for automated retrieval in their catalogue.

In case of successive parts of a work, attributed to different authors, the Paris Principles recommend the main entry under the author of the first part.

Many of the rules found exceptions to this principle. AACR2 notes that the main entry is changed to another person/body if that person/body is predominant for the multipart monograph as a whole, and that main entry is changed to title if more than three persons/bodies are responsible for the completed multipart monograph. However, the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) is currently considering removing these two possibilities to bring the rules back in line with the Paris Principles. The Vatican rules and the Finnish rules have adopted the AACR2 rules. The Czech rules make a distinction that when there are significant titles of the parts, they create new records. Similarly the Netherlands' rules also allowed for making separate records. In the Spanish rules there are some exceptions when there is a redaction plan from the beginning, and there is an author of the major part, even if he/she is not the first one named.

Following principle 11 works are entered under title when the author is not ascertained, or when the work is by more than three authors, none of whom is principal author, or when collections of independent works or parts of works, by different authors, are published with a collective title or when works are known primarily or conventionally by title. The rules agree, except on this last point – some rules would make the main entry heading for the author, i.e. Czech rules and Macedonian PPIAK, and AFNOR would enter serials under corporate body heading as appropriate. PPIAK in Croatia does not specify this latter rule. The Finnish rules place all serials in this category.

Apart from the Macedonian PPIAK and the Bulgarian RAKK, all rules agree to make added entries under title for anonymous editions of works whose authors have been ascertained (i.e. main entry has been made under the author) and for works with author main entry heading, when the title is an important alternative means of identification. The Paris Principles also recommend to make added entries under title for works with corporate body main entry heading with distinctive titles not including the name of the corporate body, and collections whose main entry is made exceptionally under the compiler. All the rules agree, and none of them follows the exception for compilers.



According to principle 11.3 in case of uniform headings for works entered under title the cataloguer should prefer the original title or the title most frequently used in editions of the work, only when the conventional title is generally known, it should be preferred. With the exception of the Bulgarian rules that do not use a uniform title but make only an entry under the title proper, most rules agree. The rules used in the Netherlands apply this only to anonymous classics. Most rules agree to prefer the title of the first part as uniform heading for works of which successive parts or volumes bear different titles, unless the majority of the parts or volumes bear another title. However the AFNOR standards do not address this.

Most rules agree with the successive entry principle for serials in Principle 11.5, however, the AFNOR standards do not address this. As regards the added entry under one selected title to group the entries, AACR2 does not use that device, nor do the rules used in the Netherlands. At the Bibliothèque Nationale de France they do create an “historical record” to link bibliographic records representing each title change. These historical records are not described in AFNOR.

Regarding the slight title variations, ISBD(CR) and most rules today, use the form on the first issue received, not the most frequently appearing form. This is a practical solution to avoid a lot of record maintenance. However, the RAK response to the survey indicated they are contrary to ISBD(CR), allowing the use of the title used most commonly as title for all issues and parts.

Principle 11.6 refers to multi-lateral international treaties and conventions and certain other categories with non-distinctive titles. In these cases a uniform conventional heading should be preferred to reflect the form of the work. Most of the codes of the survey agree, but the rules in the Netherlands have no corresponding rule. In the Bulgarian rules they use the title proper and not a uniform conventional heading.

Principle 12 dedicated to the entry word for personal names says that in case of names with several words, the cataloguer should follow agreed usage in the country of which the author is a citizen or if that is not possible, by agreed usage in the language the author generally uses.

Some respondents to the survey indicated they follow IFLA Names of Persons⁵. The IFLA Cataloguing Section will be exploring taking up a revision of that publication with an effort to be more consistent in the responses from the various countries. It is also hoped that a virtual international authority file will allow broader access to existing machine-readable authority files for sharing information on authorized forms of names.

At least we should see if we can agree that the forms and names found on publications should be included as either the authorized form or variants in authority records for the entity to facilitate future sharing and matching of authority records for the same entity.

¹ AACR2 (Anglo-American), AAKP (Czech), AFNOR (French), BAV (Vatican), KBARSM (Lithuanian), KBSDB (Danish), KSB (Swedish), MSZ (Hungarian), PPIAK (Croatian), PPIAK (Macedonian), PPIAK (Slovenia), RAK (German), RAKK (Bulgarian), RC (Spanish), RCR (Russian), RICA (Italian), RT (Dutch), SL (Finnish)

² Statement of principles *adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961* / with commentary and examples by Eva Verona ... – London : IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971



3rd IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code
الإجتماع الثالث لإفلا للخبراء في قواعد الفهرسة الدولية.
December 12-14, 2005 in Cairo, Egypt

³ see <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/garr/garr.pdf>

⁴ see the archive of the discussion list at: <http://elma.ddb.de/elma.php?uid=guest&lid=5>

⁵ Names of Persons : national usages for entry in catalogues. – 4. rev. and enl. Edition. – München ... : Saur, 1996. – (UBCIM publications : N.S. ; 16)