

LIS 640- Christian Burris
Mid-term Exam
Spring 2010

Answer three from the following five questions. Number each answer with the number of the question you are answering—not with the order in which you answered them. The completed responses should be placed in the *Blackboard Drop Box* for the course by midnight, March 18, 2010. I would anticipate that you should not spend over three hours on this—it is not a research paper, but you are permitted to use AACRII and other resources in the course in formulating an answer.

1. It has been asserted that AACRII is written to address distinctions at the *edition* level. What does this mean and why is it important?
2. The concept of *Main Entry* has been a major force driving the development of cataloging codes. What does it mean and why is it important?
3. AACRII Rule 22.14 has that strange “addition to names” provision for the dead. Why would the committee compiling this allow that to happen?
4. AACRII Rules 1.0D1, 1.0D2, and 1.0D3 specify the information required for the three levels of description allowable in descriptive cataloging. Why would we have three levels and in what contexts might they be used?
5. Adaptations of works into other forms and translations pose complex problems throughout *AACRII*. Discuss the rationale for these rules and how much adaptation is necessary to mandate another main entry for a work.

2. The concept of Main Entry has been a major force driving the development of cataloging codes. What does it mean and why is it important?

Before the advent of extensive cataloging rules, the organization of library collections was haphazard at best and massively disorganized at its worst. Examples of problems that could be encountered include authors who would produce multiple works, pseudonyms, and works with no author given. These situations often led to materials that could not be easily found either by patrons or the librarians who would be providing service.

As described by Chan, the idea Main Entry was an attempt to solve the problems with manual card systems as well as the development of a standard method of citation between records in an online environment (Chan 2007). Much more than this, however, it was a means to cite a body of work related to a particular author, whether it was a person or a corporate body. A Main Entry serves as the primary source of access for a particular work through a statement of responsibility; in cases where an individual or corporate body cannot be found, then the title of the work itself becomes that point of access.

Another point of importance for a Main Entry is the correlation of a uniform title. Through the coordination of uniform titles, works can be centralized around a specific point, hence the importance of authority records. The works of Mark Twain, for instance, can be associated with the recognized pseudonym of the author who was born Samuel Langhorne Clemens; additionally, works published by other pseudonyms of Mark Twain can relate back to the Main Entry as Added Entries by the same author. By normalizing the relationship between a recognized convention for a particular Main Entry, all works

by a particular author can be presented together whether in a card catalog or in an integrated library system.

Modern cataloging codes, specifically AACR2, are driven by elements of standardization, and the Main Entry serves as a starting point for all remaining information to be created. When a cataloger has to rely upon the information in the work at hand to develop a particular record, the usefulness of this methodology becomes clear at the initial point of entry.

3. AACR2 Rule 22.14 has that strange “addition to names” provision for the dead. Why would the committee compiling this allow that to happen?

As described in its introduction, AACR2 is an attempt for any situation in cataloging that may arise. Most situations have involved the development of new forms of media, such as the URLs for websites as well as the running time for films released on home video. By far, the choice to include “spirit” designation for the addition to names has been the most interesting; however, it has its roots in the changing nature of the materials that encompass human thought and understanding.

Beginning with Panizzi’s Principles and continuing with Jewett’s Principles, attempts were made to acknowledge the knowledge of authors who chose to write under pseudonyms and assumed names (Babb 2005). At the same time these rules became adopted into standard library practices, interest in supernatural phenomena began to capture the interests of the public. As written, both the 1908 Catalog Rules and the 1949 Catalog Rules were able to account for the use of pseudonyms but not the use of information purported to be from a deceased individual contacted through a spiritual medium.

At the time of the adoption of AACR in 1967, the principles had been revised so that a cataloger could use the item in hand to create a cataloging record, especially the title page. Unfortunately, title pages that identified a spiritual author were unable to be accounted for completely (Babb 2005). It was not until the adoption Rule 22.14 in AACR2 that a designation recognizing spiritual authorship could finally be outlined. Though the adoption of this rule created its share of controversy, it shifted the need to a true bibliographic approach to materials rather than a biographical one, allowing the cataloger to rely upon the material to be cataloged (Babb 2005).

Catalogers have been tasked to describe materials without becoming a correspondent themselves. Before the adoption of Rule 22.14, catalogers did not have a clear foundation to approach materials with such a unique form of authorship. In its wake, these works were given the opportunity to exist on their own standing without the complications that would be associated with assigning a pseudonym instead. As described previously, this was a response by the AACR2 committee to a specific need that arose from an evolving problem.

4. AACRII Rules 1.0D1, 1.0D2, and 1.0D3 specify the information required for the three levels of description allowable in descriptive cataloging. Why would we have three levels and in what contexts might they be used?

As cited in Rules for Dictionary Catalog by Charles Cutter and further clarified by Rules 1.0D1, 1.0D2 and 1.0D3, a flexible code was created to allow for the creation of cataloging records that would serve the needs of library patrons as well as library staff (Chan 2007). Libraries could adapt these records to a level of complexity that would be specific to the local library only and determined by local cataloging policies; as a result,

the amount of cataloging required to make a particular record accessible to both patrons and staff alike would be clearly defined.

The three levels of catalog records build on each other, adding more fields for descriptive information. Rule 1.0D1 mentions such characteristics as title proper, first statement of responsibility, edition statement, details about the material, publisher, date of publication, extent of item, notes, and standard numbers (Joint Steering Committee for Revision of, American Library et al. 2005). Rule 1.0D2 includes the descriptors of Rule 1.0D1, adding descriptors such as parallel titles, edition statements of responsibility, and ISSN; while Rule 1.0D3 incorporates the entirety of Rule 1.0D2 along with descriptors regarding language, inaccuracies, accents, and other diacritics (Joint Steering Committee for Revision of, American Library et al. 2005).

Depending on the size and complexity of a specific library, these rules would form the cornerstone of local cataloging practices. Smaller libraries, such special libraries and school libraries would be able to get by with the elements of Rule 1.0D1, since patrons would either not need more specific details or the collection itself would not need higher levels of description. Rule 1.0D2 could be used in community college libraries, small academic libraries and public libraries where information regarding title changes and specific serials information would be especially relevant. Larger research libraries and library consortia would benefit from Rule 1.0D3, since specific information about languages and diacritics such as umlauts and would be necessary to distinguish between two titles with similar names.

Above all else, the three cataloging levels should serve the librarians responsible for keeping this information. If the items in a library collection do not demand an

extensive cataloging record, the surrogates standing for these records in a library catalog should remain as simple as possible. This, in a small way, hearkens back to Ranganathan's principles regarding books and the readers who use them: do not separate them unnecessarily.

References

Babb, N. M. (2005). "Cataloging Spirits and the Spirit of Cataloging." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly **40**(2): 89-122.

Chan, L. M. (2007). Cataloging and Classification : An Introduction. Lanham, Maryland, Scarecrow Press.

Joint Steering Committee for Revision of, A., A. American Library, et al. (2005). Anglo-American cataloguing rules : second edition : 2002 revision : 2005 update. Chicago, American Library Association.