Title
What is a Work? Part 1, The User and the Objects of the Catalog.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2d07p1z1

Journal
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 19(1)

Author
Yee, Martha M

Publication Date
1994

Peer reviewed

Martha M. Yee
August 1993 draft

WHAT IS A WORK?: PART 1, THE USER AND THE OBJECTS OF THE CATALOG

A. Introduction

Present day Anglo-American cataloging practice, arguably with some exceptions, requires that two editions of the same work be given the same main entry heading and that a new record be made for each different manifestation of a work. The second object of the catalog suggests that the catalog user should be shown all the works of an author and all the editions of a work. Yet a definition of <u>work</u> has never been included in the glossary of any Anglo-American code. This is the first in a series of articles that explore the concept of <u>work</u> and attempt to construct a definition of the term based on Anglo-American cataloging theory and practice.

The exploration begins with a consideration of the objects of the catalog, their history, and the evidence that bears on the question of whether or not the second object serves the library user; in other words, the question of the degree to which the user needs access to the work, as opposed to a particular edition of the work.

There is another reason for considering the objects of the catalog first. In the next article in the series, main entry practice will be studied in order to reveal the acting concept of <u>work</u> at various stages in the development of Anglo-American cataloging rules. In extrapolating concepts of <u>work</u> from rules for choice of main entry, it is necessary to be aware of the context within which the rules were meant to operate, i.e. whether they were designed for book catalogs or card catalogs. It is also necessary to be aware of the state of

cataloging theory at the time, i.e. whether the main entry was conceived of as a single heading, either the author or the title if the work is entered under title, or whether instead it was conceived of as an author-title or title citation form for a work. Therefore, in order to arrive at a definition of <u>work</u>, it will be helpful to begin with a historical and theoretical examination of the objects of the catalog, the concept of <u>finding list</u>, and main entry practice in book and card catalogs.

In the second article in the series, actual cataloging practice will be examined, with special attention to rules for determining when changes in text or substance or in representation of a work caused the creation of a new work. Finally, in the third article, we will look at what cataloging theorists have had to say about the concept of <u>work</u>, and attempt to produce a definition.

B. Objects of the catalog and means of implementing them.

Cutter was the first to state the objects of the catalog and discuss techniques for implementing them. In doing so, however, he was making explicit what had been implicit in previous codes of cataloging rules and previous practice in catalogs. A number of writers have investigated and written about Anglo-American cataloging practice prior to Cutter, and the following account relies on secondary sources rather than on examination of the catalogs themselves.[1] Cataloging rules (Bodleian, Panizzi and Jewett) have also been examined.

In the following analysis we will be primarily interested in what was to become the second object of the catalog, the gathering together of the works of an author and the editions of a work. The beginnings of the Anglo-American cataloging tradition are probably most conveniently traced to the Bodleian catalogs of the 17th century. As Frost points out, the first Bodleian catalogs (1602, 1603-4 and 1605) were primarily arranged by subject or what we would today term <u>discipline</u>, then by book size, and only then by author.

The 1620 catalog was the first to use author as the primary arrangement. This might then be considered to be the first Anglo-American catalog to gather together the works of an author. The 1674 catalog contained in its preface what are generally considered to be the first set of cataloging rules in the Anglo-American tradition. These rules were to influence practice in British and American libraries for several centuries.[2] Explicit in the rules is the fact that all the works of an author are entered under a single form of name for the author. Implicit in practice, Frost demonstrates, is the fact that all editions of a particular work with an author are gathered together under the author's name, as well, regardless of changes in titles; the subgrouping of the editions of a work based on language and publication date is evident in the 1674 catalog and becomes even more elaborate in the 1738 catalog. There is apparently no evidence, however, that the same attempt to gather together the editions of a work entered under title was made. It is important to observe that the Bodleian catalogs were book catalogs, and that the gathering function was carried out not by means of the assignment of alphabetically identical headings, but by placement on the page, determined by the catalog editor.

Panizzi's 91 rules continued to call for displaying together all the works of an author, although, as Lubetzky and Verona point out, in the case of pseudonymous or anonymous works with known authors, this principle was not followed consistently, probably because of the difficulties of revising portions of a book catalog already printed on the basis of information discovered later.[3] Panizzi's 91 rules included rules for arrangement which made explicit the gathering together of all editions of a work with an author, regardless of changes in titles. In addition, the rules for gathering together the editions of the Bible under a uniform title represent the beginning of the recognition of the need to gather together works entered under title when the title changes.

Jewett's rules went further than Panizzi's in gathering together the works of an

author, since pseudonymous and anonymous works are entered under author if any edition of the work has been published under the name of the author. In keeping Panizzi's rules for arrangement, Jewett's rules continued Panizzi's approach to gathering together the editions of a work entered under author. It must be remembered that his stereotyped plates were meant to be used in the production of book catalogs, so while arrangement based on headings rigidly alphabetical enough to guarantee a particular filing order was envisioned at several points in his rules, he apparently did not foresee a need to go beyond the author heading in this.[4] In rule XXIII, Jewett called for the entry of the translation of a work entered under title under its original title, thus extending considerably Panizzi's rules for gathering together the editions of a work entered under title.

Cutter was the first to make the objects of the catalog explicit and to discuss specific ways to carry them out. The objects according to Cutter are quoted below:

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

MEANS
1. Author-entry with the necessary references (for A and D).
2. Title-entry or title reference (for B).
3. Subject-entry, cross references, and classed subject-table (for
    C and E).
4. Form-entry (for F).
5. Giving edition and imprint, with notes when necessary (for G).
6. Notes (for H).[5]

We will not be concerned here with C, E, F and H. Note how in Cutter's version of the objects only collocation of the works of an author is explicit, not the collocation of all the editions of a work. He states that the means for assisting in the choice of a book as to its edition are the edition statement, the imprint and the notes, rather than referring to the need to ensure that all the editions of a work are displayed together to facilitate the user's choice among them. In fact, however, Cutter's rules followed Jewett's in bringing together all editions of a work, whether entered under author or title, regardless of title changes.

The rules published by the Library Association of the United Kingdom in 1881 and 1883 should perhaps be mentioned here, since they extended Panizzi's rules for the Bible to cover other sacred works for the first time.

The first true Anglo-American code, the 1908 rules, while heavily influenced by Cutter, left out the objects of the catalog, dropped the rules for arrangement that since the time of Panizzi had called for the gathering and careful organization of all the editions of a work entered under author, and dropped the rules for entering translations of modern anonymous works under their original titles, although the uniform titles for sacred works were retained, and rules for uniform titles for anonymous classics were added. Henceforth, separately published filing rules would contain the guidelines for the arrangement of works entered under author and each library was free to determine its own filing rules. The card catalog, with its separate records and constantly growing size, with its arrangement dependent on rigidly alphabetical headings for the guidance of filers who might not be catalogers, had arrived on the scene. For the next fifty years, Anglo-American codes remained similar to the 1908 rules in this regard. The Library of Congress in its own filing rules recorded methods for elaborate organization of the works of a single author such that the editions of a work filed together regardless of title changes,[6] but this arrangement was not determined by headings distributed on printed cards, so other libraries could not benefit from it.

In the middle 1950's, Lubetzky began work on a number of drafts of his Code of cataloging rules which proposed a return to Jewett's and Cutter's collocation of all the editions of a work, whether entered under author or title; now, however, instead of embodying this collocation in rules for arrangement suitable for a book catalog, he suggested the extension of the use of uniform titles to all works which had been published in manifestations with different titles. In effect, this was a proposal to move from a concept of main entry as the author heading for a work entered under author, to a concept of main entry as the author and title heading for a work entered under author, as well as the more familiar use of uniform titles for some works, at least, entered under title. This new approach would have been more suitable for ensuring that editions of a work would be gathered together in card catalogs produced by the filing of cards created by cooperative cataloging in libraries all over the country, especially by the Library of Congress.

Lubetzky also revived Cutter's objects of the catalog. Lubetzky's objects no longer dealt with the subject catalog or with form access. He simplified Cutter's objects to the point that only two objects were necessary. In their final published form, these were:

Objectives:
The objectives which the catalog is to serve are two:
First, to facilitate the location of a particular publication,
i.e., of a particular edition of a work, which is in the
library.
Second, to relate and display together the editions which a
library has of a given work and the works which it has
of a given author.[7]

Here, for the first time, the collocation of all the editions of the work is made explicit. In the two drafts previous to the published 1960 draft, those of 1956 and 1958, the first object was different in a significant way: instead of referring to a particular edition of a work, it referred to a particular work.[8] The phrasing of Lubetzky's second objective in terms of "the editions of a given work" has led a number of cataloging theorists to question how often

users are seeking all the editions of a work.[9] In fact, however, the main purpose of this objective was to aid the seeker of a <u>particular work</u> in the choice of edition or manifestation, if more than one were available, or to aid the seeker of a <u>particular work</u> to find any available

manifestation.[10] Perhaps the phrase <u>a particular work</u> used in his earlier drafts could have conveyed this intent more clearly if transposed from the first objective to the second.

Another significant aspect to Lubetzky's version of the objects of the catalog is the combination in a single object of the collocation of the editions of a work, and the collocation of the works of an author. For Lubetzky, conditions of authorship are the primary organizing factor in the library catalog. Main entry under author serves the dual function of gathering together the works of an author and of gathering together the editions of those works. However, main entry based on authorship can cause the separation under two different author main entries of two manifestations of what many might consider the same work. This will be discussed further later in the third in this series of articles.

Verona speaks of three cataloging objectives, breaking Lubetzky's second objective into two parts. In the annotated edition of the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Verona points out that the fact that the works of an author can be found does not necessarily imply that the editions of a particular work can also be found, since it does not apply to works entered under title, nor does it necessarily mean that in the sub-arrangement under the author's name, all editions of the same work are brought together.[11] For clarity of thought, it is perhaps preferable to consider these three different objectives.

The objects of the catalog were adopted by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in Paris in 1961 in the following form:

2. Functions of the catalogue
The catalogue should be an efficient instrument for ascertaining
> 2.1 whether the library contains a particular book speci-
> fied by
> (a) its author and title, <u>or</u>
> (b) if the author is not named in the book, its
> title alone, <u>or</u>
> (c) if the author and title are inappropriate or
> insufficient for identification, a suitable
> substitute for the title; and
> 2.2 (a) which works by a particular author and
> (b) which editions of a particular work are in the
> library.[12]

The use in this version of the first objective of the term <u>particular book</u> was perhaps unfortunate, since not everyone has grasped the distinction Lubetzky made between the book and the work. It is possible that substitution for the phrase <u>particular book</u> of either <u>particular edition</u> or <u>particular manifestation</u> might have prevented the misunderstanding on the part of a number of prominent catalogers whose equation of a <u>known item</u> search with a search which could be served by a catalog which meets only the first object is described below. The version of the objects of the catalog adopted by the ICCP is the version most readily available to writers in our field, as well as the version which has actually been adopted as an international standard.

Although the adoption of the objects by the ICCP made them an international standard, AACR1 and AACR2, so ready to adopt other international standards, did not adopt them. Thus the objects of the catalog have never been formally incorporated in any Anglo-American code. AACR1, heavily influenced by Lubetzky's work in other ways, did not adopt his approach to the collocation of all the editions of a work. A chapter on uniform titles was included, but their use was optional and in practice their use was largely restricted to works of voluminous authors, anonymous

classics and sacred books. AACR2 follows AACR1 in this respect.

C. The concept of <u>finding list</u>.

Several writers, Koel and Hall and Seal, describe a catalog which meets only the first object, that of allowing the user to find a particular manifestation of a work, as a <u>finding list</u> or <u>finding tool</u>.[13] The term is not very descriptive; as Edward Edwards wrote as far back as 1859, "In one sense, indeed, all catalogues must be `finding' catalogues or they are worthless."[14] An examination of how this term has been used historically will help to clarify several possible meanings it has had, and thus, perhaps, contribute to clearer and more accurate use of the term in the future.   The term was apparently first used during the sessions concerning the British Museum catalog which were part of the hearings of the Royal Commission investigating the management of the British Museum, held from 1847 to 1849. Users of the British Museum, who desired a catalog of the collection in a much shorter period of time than Panizzi planned to take to construct a "full and accurate catalog," urged that instead a "finding catalog" be constructed. Examination of the testimony of Panizzi's opponents reveals that they perceived such a catalog primarily in terms of "short title" records, or records with abbreviated titles and fewer descriptive elements than Panizzi was proposing. In modern day terms, this discussion pertained to levels of description. Panizzi's tactic in opposing the advocates of a finding catalog was to invite one of them, Collier, to produce some of the cataloging he was claiming could be so quickly done; Panizzi then analyzed Collier's cataloging and pointed out some major problems with it in the context of a collection as large as that of the British Museum. Some of the problems Panizzi described arose from the fact that Collier was cataloging from the title page of a single item without consideration for the fact that the item was a particular manifestation of a particular work by a particular author, other editions and works of which existed in the

BM collections with different forms of name and title on their title pages.[15]

Level of description is quite a distinct concept from the concept of gathering together the works of an author and the editions of a work by means of choice of main entry and authority work. A quite abbreviated description could be organized by means of a normalized author main entry and a uniform title into a catalog which meets the second objective perfectly. A description full and accurate to the nth degree could be scattered to the winds by means of a unit entry approach to the organization of the catalog. However, from Panizzi's time to this, these two concepts of the term finding list, that of abbreviated description, and that of item-based rather than work-based description, have remained intertwined and I would assert have clouded our thinking on two important issues, that of how full a description is necessary, and that of how the catalog should be organized, regardless of the fullness of description practiced. As evidence that we are still using two different meanings for the term finding list, compare the following two quotations:

> As finding lists, most catalogs could well suffice if they displayed
> records with minimal-level description and a limited number of
> access points per record. On the other hand, as reference tools
> it could be desirable, and perhaps necessary, to enrich the catalog
> record with fuller bibliographic descriptions and a greater number
> of access points than is customary at present.[16]

> Listing all works by a given author under a uniform heading incon-
> veniences those who use the catalog as a finding tool, i.e. for
> known item searches, when the uniform heading differs from the
> author's name or form of name appearing in the items themselves.[17]

Williamson adds yet a third meaning to the concept of finding list, that of a catalog with fewer access points per record than the records in a reference or bibliographic tool. Again, this is quite a different issue from that of how the catalog should be organized or how full the description should be. Single entry records, if the single entry consists of the preferred form of an author's name and a uniform title, can create a catalog which meets the second

objective perfectly; with the addition of cross references, the first objective can be met as well. Lubetzky once pointed out that such a catalog might in fact be preferable to a catalog with multiple access points, since the former guarantees that the user is shown everything the library has which might be of interest or substitutable for or preferable to what he or she is seeking, whereas in a catalog with multiple access points, the user looking at an added entry can easily miss items of interest found only at the main entry.[18] These single entry records could have quite full descriptions or quite abbreviated descriptions without affecting the organization of the catalog.

Since the term <u>finding list</u> has been used for such different concepts, the best solution to this problem of inaccurate professional terminology may be to dispense with the term altogether, and indicate more specifically which issue is being discussed: the issue of fullness of description, the issue of how to organize the catalog, or the issue of how many access points to provide. If the term is used, however, an argument could be made that through its use by our leading cataloging theorists, its meaning has come to be that of a catalog which bases its cataloging on describing an item in hand, disregarding the fact that it may be a manifestation of a work known under other titles, by an author known by other names, and that of a catalog which carries out only the first objective of the catalog, but not the second, failing therefore to display to the user the works of an author and the editions of a work. This is the sense in which the term has been used by Pettee, Lubetzky, Verona and Malinconico.[19]

D. Use of the first and second objects of the catalog

No catalog use study heretofore has attempted to study the relative value to catalog users of the first and second objects of the catalog. However, over the years, cataloging theorists have postulated the ways in which these objects serve catalog users, and these are

summarized below. If these observations about users are true, users do indeed benefit from the second object.

First, a number of cataloging theorists have suggested that most known-item searchers are looking for a work, not a particular edition of a work.[20] Most users can use any edition of a work.[21] The user doesn't tend to know ahead of time that there are several different editions of the work sought.[22] Even if the user is aware of the fact there are several editions, he or she may not be aware of the differences between editions that might affect access.[23] Even the user aware of multiple editions may not realize that a new edition has just come out; the latest edition of a scientific text or a new and particularly reliable text of a work of belle lettres may actually be preferable to a sought edition.[24] A user looking for a particular edition may have an inaccurate citation for the particular edition sought.[25] A user looking for a particular edition not in the library might be able to use another that is.[26] Works contained within other works and analyzed only by means of a name-title added entry, and related works, such as works about the work sought, can be found in only one place in the catalog--the main entry created in the course of fulfilling the second objective. Users who benefit from serendipity benefit from the second objective.[27]

Several examples might serve to make these observations more concrete. Consider a request that might easily be encountered at the reference desk in a medical library. A user asks to see the latest edition of Guyton's <u>Basic Human Physiology</u>. At first glance, this <u>known item</u> search <u>is</u> for a particular edition of a work, but a closer look is warranted. If one does an author search, the following will be seen:

    Guyton, Arthur Clifton, 1919-
      Basic human physiology : normal function and
    mechanisms of disease ...

    Guyton, Arthur Clifton, 1919-
      Basic human physiology : normal function and
    mechanisms of disease / Arthur C. Guyton. --
    2d ed. -- Philadelphia : Saunders, 1977. ...

Guyton, Arthur Clifton, 1919-
  Function of the human body ...

Guyton, Arthur Clifton, 1919-
  Function of the human body / Arthur C. Guyton. --
3d ed. ...

Guyton, Arthur Clifton, 1919-
  Function of the human body / Arthur C. Guyton. --
4th ed. ...

Guyton, Arthur Clifton, 1919-
  Human physiology and mechanisms of disease /
Arthur C. Guyton. -- 3rd ed. -- Philadelphia :
W.B. Saunders, 1982.
  x, 709 p. : ill. ; 28 cm.
  Rev. ed. of: Basic human physiology. 2nd ed.
1977.

If one did a name title search using the title word basic, or if one looked only at the records in the display under author beginning with the word basic, one might conclude that the latest edition of the work sought came out in 1977. However, if one searched the entire file under the author (i.e. the main entry), reading each record down through the note level, one would find that a third edition came out in 1982 under the title Human physiology and mechanisms of disease. Remember, the user has no way of knowing that the third edition has changed title. Only the user with special knowledge of the power of the main entry can be sure he or she has found the latest edition. Nevertheless, to the degree that the second objective has been implemented in existing catalogs, the capability is there of finding all the editions of a work without having to know exactly what each title page looked like. The user in search of this work by Guyton would be best served, however, by a catalog which displayed all the editions of a work together in response to any search for a particular edition, even though this user is in fact seeking a particular edition of a work (the latest).

Now consider another example. A user comes into the library looking for a book

called <u>Lords of the levee</u>. The library does not have an edition of the work under that title, but it does have the same work under the title <u>Bosses in lusty Chicago</u>, which, in addition, has an introduction by Paul Douglas. If the library's catalog, whether manual or on-line, is a mere finding list, it will tell the user that the library does not own the item he seeks, and that she will have to pursue her search elsewhere. If the library's catalog is a <u>bibliographic tool</u>, it will tell the user that the library does in fact have the work she is seeking, but in another edition with a different title.

It can be seen that in both these examples, the powerful key-word searching capability offered by on-line systems does not solve the problem. Key-words retrieve all editions of a work only if the key-words chosen for searching happen to be present on the title pages of all editions of the work, spelled and formatted in exactly the same way. Titles and editors are subject to change, and it would be folly to expect the user who seeks the latest edition of a work, or any available edition, to know about these changes; nor can we expect public service librarians to know about them.

E. User studies: known item searches

A number of user studies have claimed to study the frequency with which users seek <u>known items</u>. The data on frequency of known item searches has then been used to argue that users need only the first objective. For example, Ake Koel writes, "Hafter points out that all major [catalog user] studies, with very few exceptions, agree that known item searches account for 60 to 85 percent of catalog use in academic libraries. . . . These and other findings suggest that a catalog designed to be primarily a finding tool would satisfy the needs of the majority."[28] Hall and Seal state in their study of the use of a short entry catalog that "the overwhelming proportion of catalogue use (77%) was to see whether the library had a book and where it was located--thus the catalogue was used largely as a

finding list."[29]

If we examine the definition of <u>known item</u> used in the user studies referred to above, we will find that the studies did not differentiate between users who would benefit from the first objective, that is users who are only interested in a particular edition of a work, and who have an exact citation to it, from users who would benefit from the second objective. Lipetz defines <u>known item</u> as "a search for the purpose of borrowing a specific known document,"[30] and later states, "in a document search (often called a <u>known item</u> search) the catalog user is aware of the existence of some particular book or publication that he wants to locate."[31] Tagliacozzo et al. state: "A known-item search is one in which the searcher is trying to locate the catalogue card of a particular work (book, journal, thesis, dictionary or other kind of catalogued material)"; this entity is later referred to in the same paragraph as <u>document</u> and <u>item</u>.[32] In another article by the same writers, known item searches are defined as "searches for a particular item (book or other document) which is known to exist (although not necessarily in the library where the search takes place) and on which the searcher has such information as author and title."[33] Simmons offers no definition, but utilizes the category of searches for a "specific publication."[34] Krikelas, in his survey of catalog use studies, states that "known item searches are defined as approaches based on information that a specific document exists and that a clue about the author, title, editor, etc., is possessed by the user."[35] An examination of the way the data was actually gathered in these studies shows that the user counted as one who is looking for a <u>known item</u> is one who has a written or oral citation to a particular author and title.

It can be seen that in defining <u>known item</u> and using the term to categorize user requests, no awareness has been shown of the distinction between <u>book</u> and <u>work</u> drawn by Seymour Lubetzky:

> The book is actually only <u>one particular edition</u>, or
> representation of the work embodied in it--which may be
> found in the library in various editions of special

interest (as first, latest, well edited, illustrated),
in various translations, in various media (as books,
tapes, discs), and sometimes, in addition, under different
titles or different names of the author.[36]

Thus, results of studies of the frequency of known item searches cannot be used to demonstrate how frequently users would benefit from the carrying out of the second objective and the display of the work, as opposed to just the first objective, or just the display of the specific edition of the work that happens to match the user's search.

F. Research on frequency with which special measures are needed to collocate editions of a work

How frequently do relationships exist between works and editions of works such that choice of a main entry or some other special technique would be required to demonstrate the relationship to the user? Only one study seems to have addressed this question. It was carried out in 1979 by Elizabeth Tate.[37] She found that 12.3% of the 1344 randomly selected works examined "either had or might someday require the assembling of a literary unit," and of these, 32% required a choice of main entry; 1% of the works examined had occasioned secondary entries (that is, were works related to other works, or had had works written about them). Her criteria for determining which works fall into which categories are not completely clear from the written description of her study; nevertheless, her research is an admirable attempt to address the problem of the frequency with which special measures must be taken in order to carry out the second objective. A correlative study might examine the frequency with which titles and choice of entry change between editions of works which exist in more than one edition.

In evaluating all such findings, it would be wise to bear in mind that while it is known that the most common case is for an author to write only a single work, and for a

work to exist in only a single edition, it is highly likely that it is the prolific author and the multiple edition work that is most sought by users. This is just common sense. Publishers continue to publish authors and works that sell because the public is interested in them.

G. Summary

The objects of the catalog, adopted internationally in 1961, assume that it is useful to display to users all the editions of a sought work, in order to enable the user to choose the best edition for his or her needs. No user study has ever divided so-called known item searchers into two groups: 1) those who benefit from the first objective alone; and 2) those who benefit from the second objective. Logic and common sense lead one to suspect that most users benefit from the second objective, and that multiple-edition works by prolific authors, those requiring the most cataloger effort to achieve collocation, are probably also the most frequently sought works.

FOOTNOTES

1.. A. Domanovszky, <u>Functions and Objects of Author and Title Cataloguing</u> (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1974), Chapter 3.
Carolyn Frost, "The Bodleian Catalogs of 1674 and 1738: an Examination in the Light of Modern Cataloging Theory," <u>Library Quarterly</u> 46 (1976): 248-270.
Eugene R. Hanson and Jay E. Daily, "Catalogs and Cataloging," <u>Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science</u> (New York: Marcel Dekker, ca. 1968) v. 4, 242-305.
Seymour Lubetzky, "The Function of the Main Entry in the Alphabetical Catalog," in International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (1961: Paris). <u>Working Papers</u>. Working paper no. 1, p. 1
Seymour Lubetzky, "Ideology of Bibliographic Cataloging: Progress and Retrogression," in <u>The Nature and Future of the Catalog</u>, eds. Maurice J. Freedman and S. Michael Malinconico (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1979), 5.
Julia Pettee, "The Development of Authorship Entry and the Formulation of Authorship Rules as Found in the Anglo-American Code," <u>Library Quarterly</u> 6 (1936): 270-290.
Jim Ranz, <u>The Printed Book Catalogue in American Libraries, 1723-1900</u> (Chicago: American Library Association, 1964)
Eva Verona, "Literary Unit Versus Bibliographical Unit," <u>Libri</u> 9 (1959): 79-104.
2.. Pettee, "The Development of Authorship Entry," 277.
Ranz, <u>The Printed Book Catalogue</u>, 2.
3.. Lubetzky, "The Function of the Main Entry," 4.
Verona, "Literary Unit Versus Bibliographical Unit," 83.
4.. Charles Coffin Jewett, "On the Construction of Catalogues," 2nd ed. 1853, in <u>Charles Coffin Jewett and American Librarianship, 1841-1868</u>, ed. by Michael H. Harris (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1975), 138, 146.
5.. Charles A. Cutter, "Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue," in <u>Public Libraries in the United States of America. Part II</u> (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1876), 10.
6.. Library of Congress. Processing Department. <u>Filing Rules for the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress</u> (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Processing Department, 1956)
7.. Seymour Lubetzky, <u>Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry</u>, an unfinished draft (Chicago: American Library Association, 1960), ix.
8.. Seymour Lubetzky, <u>Code for Cataloging: Authors & Titles</u>, rev. ed., partial draft (American Library Association, Code Revision Committee, Dec. 1956), 3.
Seymour Lubetzky, <u>Code of Cataloging Rules</u> (Chicago: American Library Association, Catalog Code Revision Committee, June 1958), 2.
9.. Elizabeth L. Tate, "Examining the 'Main' in Main Entry Headings," in <u>The Making of a Code</u>, ed. Doris Hargrett Clack (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980), 109-140.
Michael Gorman, "Authority Control in the Prospective Catalog," in <u>Authority Control: the Key to Tomorrow's Catalog: Proceedings of the 1979 Library and Information Technology Association Institutes</u>, ed. Mary W. Ghikas (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1982), 169.
10.. Seymour Lubetzky, <u>Cataloging Rules and Principles</u> (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Processing Dept., 1953), 36.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1956, 3.

Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1958, 2.

Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1960, x.

Seymour Lubetzky, <u>Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry: Additions, Revisions, and Changes Prepared in Light of Discussions of the March 1960 Draft for Consideration of the Catalog Code Revision Committee</u> (Chicago, IL: American Library Association, Sept. 1961), 2.

Lubetzky, "The Function of the Main Entry," 5.

Seymour Lubetzky, <u>Principles of Cataloging</u> (Los Angeles, CA: Institute of Catalog Research, 1969), 12.

11.. Verona, "Literary Unit Versus Bibliographical Unit," 79.

Eva Verona, "The Function of the Main Entry in the Alphabetical Catalog," in International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (1961: Paris), <u>Working Papers</u>, Working paper no. 3, p. 146 in the 1971 ed.

International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (1961: Paris), <u>Statement of Principles</u>, annotated ed. with commentary and examples by Eva Verona (London: IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971), 8.

12.. International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (1961: Paris), <u>Statement of Principles</u>, 1971, xiii.

13.. Ake I. Koel, "Bibliographic Control at the Crossroads: Do We Get Our Money's Worth?" <u>Journal of Academic Librarianship</u> 7 (1981): 221.

Carolyn Hall and Alan Seal, "A Short-Entry Catalogue Put to the Test," <u>Catalogue and Index</u> 56 (1980): 6.

14.. Edward Edwards, <u>Memoirs of Libraries</u> (New York: Burt Franklin, repr. of orig. 1859 publ.), 750-751.

15.. Nancy Brault, <u>The Great Debate on Panizzi's Rules in 1847-1849</u> (Los Angeles: the School of Library Service and the University Library, 1972), 45-46.

16.. Nancy J. Williamson, "Is There a Catalog in Your Future?" <u>Library Resources & Technical Services</u> 26 (1982): 129.

17.. Lois M. Chan, "The Principle of Uniform Heading in Descriptive Cataloging," <u>Cataloging & Classification Quarterly</u> 3 (1983): 22.

18.. Lubetzky, <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 20-22.

19.. Julia Pettee, "The New Code: a Consideration of the Basic Principles of Our Author Catalogs," <u>Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook</u> 11 (1945): 8.

Lubetzky, <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 9.

Lubetzky, "Ideology of Bibliographic Cataloging," 6-8.

Verona, "Literary Unit Versus Bibliographical Unit," 79.

S. Michael Malinconico, "Technology and Standards for Bibliographic Control," <u>Library Quarterly</u> 47 (1977): 319.

20.. A. Hugh Chaplin, <u>Tradition and Principle in Library Cataloguing</u> (Toronto: University of Toronto School of Library Science, 1966?), 12-13.

Domanovszky, <u>Functions and Objects of Author and Title Cataloguing</u>, 89.

Seymour Lubetzky, "The Function of the Catalog," <u>College & Research Libraries</u> 17 (1956): 214.

Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1956, 3-4.

Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1958, 2.

Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 2.
Lubetzky, <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 12, 13.
Verona, "The Function of the Main Entry," 4.
21.. Douglas A. Cargille, "Variant Edition Cataloging on OCLC: Input or Adapt?"
<u>Library Resources & Technical Services</u> 26 (1982): 50.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1956, 3-4.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1958, 2.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1961, 2.
Lubetzky, <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 12.
Joan K. Marshall, "Uniform titles," in <u>The Making of a Code</u>, International Conference on AACR2 (1979: Tallahassee, Florida), ed., Doris Hargrett Clack (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980), 181.
Jerry L. Parsons, "Musings on the Future of the Catalog," <u>Technical Services Quarterly</u> 1 (1983): 106.
Verona, "The Function of the Main Entry," 4.
22.. Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Constitution and Government of the British Museum, <u>Report ... With Minutes of Evidence</u> (London: HMSO, 1850), 695.
Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. <u>Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress</u> (Washington, D.C.: LC, DCD, 1949), xx.
Lubetzky. <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 12.
23.. Chaplin, <u>Tradition and Principle</u>, 12-13.
Commissioners, <u>Report</u>, 695.
Domanovszky, <u>Functions and Objects of Author and Title Cataloguing</u>, 61.
Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. <u>Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress</u> (Washington, D.C.: LC, DCD, 1949), xx.
Lubetzky, <u>Cataloging Rules and Principles</u>, 35.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1956, 3-4.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1958, 2.
Lubetzky, "The Function of the Main Entry," 5, 150.
Verona, "The Function of the Main Entry," 4.
24.. Robert N. Broadus, "The Problem of Dates in Bibliographic Citations,"
<u>College & Research Libraries</u> 29 (1968): 387.
Commissioners, <u>Report</u>, 695.
Library of Congress, <u>Rules</u>, 1949, xx.
Lubetzky, <u>Cataloging Rules and Principles</u>, 35.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 2.
Lubetzky, "The Function of the Main Entry," 5, 150.
Bohdan S. Wynar, <u>Introduction to Cataloging and Classification</u>, 6th ed. (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1980), 20.
25.. Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1956, 3-4.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1960, x.
Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1961, 2.
Lubetzky. <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 13.
26.. Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1961, 2.
27.. Lubetzky, <u>Code</u>, 1956, 3-4.

28.. Koel, "Bibliographic Control at the Crossroads," 221.

29.. Hall and Seal, "A Short-Entry Catalogue Put to the Test," 6.

30.. Ben-Ami Lipetz, <u>User Requirements in Identifying Desired Works in a Library</u>
(New Haven: Yale University Library, 1970), 17.

31.. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 43.

32.. Renata Tagliacozzo, Lawrence Rosenberg and Manfred Kochen, "Access and Recognition: From Users' Data to Catalogue Entries," <u>Journal of Documentation</u> 26 (1970): 231.

33.. Renata Tagliacozzo and Manfred Kochen, "Information-seeking Behavior of Catalog Users," <u>Information Storage and Retrieval</u> 6 (1970): 364.

34.. Peter Simmons, "Studies in the Use of the Card Catalogue in a Public Library,"
<u>Canadian Library Journal</u> 31 (1974): 331.

35.. James Krikelas, "Catalog Use Studies and Their Implications," <u>Advances in Librarianship</u> 3 (1972): 200.

36.. Lubetzky, <u>Principles of Cataloging</u>, 12.

37.. Tate, "Examining the 'Main' in Main Entry Headings," 135.