



## International Cataloguing Tradition and Italian Rules: Common Ground and Specific Features

Carlo Bianchini & Mauro Guerrini

**To cite this article:** Carlo Bianchini & Mauro Guerrini (2007) International Cataloguing Tradition and Italian Rules: Common Ground and Specific Features, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 44:1-2, 131-150, DOI: [10.1300/J104v44n01\\_09](https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v44n01_09)

**To link to this article:** [http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J104v44n01\\_09](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J104v44n01_09)



Published online: 12 Oct 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 32



View related articles [↗](#)

# International Cataloguing Tradition and Italian Rules: Common Ground and Specific Features

Carlo Bianchini  
Mauro Guerrini

**SUMMARY.** Many current cataloguing codes have their roots in a common tradition started by the 1961 Paris International Conference on Cataloguing Principles–ICCP. Since 1961, the construction of new national codes had been based on the sharing of cataloguing principles, on agreements for international cooperation, and on a common tradition. The new technological and international environment suggests, more and more, a redesign of those principles to include more suitable features and to assert firmly that the highest principle is the convenience of the users of the catalogue. Within this framework, the authors analyze the

---

Carlo Bianchini is Librarian, Natural History Museum of Udine, Via Lionello 1, I-33100 Udine, Italy (E-mail: c.bianchini@iol.it). Mauro Guerrini is Professor, Library and Information Science, Università degli Studi di Firenze (Florence University, Italy), Dipartimento di Studi sul Medioevo e Rinascimento, Piazza Brunelleschi, 6, I-50121 Firenze, Italy (E-mail: m.guerrini@leonet.it; Home page: <http://www.meri.unifi.it/meri/guerrini.html>).

The article was planned together by both authors who are in agreement on its total contents. Nevertheless, Carlo Bianchini is more responsible for Section 1 while Mauro Guerrini is more responsible for Section 2.

[Haworth co-indexing entry note]: "International Cataloguing Tradition and Italian Rules: Common Ground and Specific Features." Bianchini, Carlo, and Mauro Guerrini. Co-published simultaneously in *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* (The Haworth Information Press, an imprint of The Haworth Press, Inc.) Vol. 44, No. 1/2, 2007, pp. 131-150; and: *Cataloger, Editor, and Scholar: Essays in Honor of Ruth C. Carter* (ed: Robert P. Holley) The Haworth Information Press, an imprint of The Haworth Press, Inc., 2007, pp. 131-150. Single or multiple copies of this article are available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service [1-800-HAWORTH, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. (EST). E-mail address: docdelivery@haworthpress.com].

Available online at <http://ccq.haworthpress.com>  
© 2007 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.  
doi:10.1300/J104v44n01\_09

Italian cataloguing tradition and its relationships with the international tradition and recount the main activities towards a revision of the present Italian code—*Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori* RICA. The paper shows that, since the first Italian rules written by Fumagalli, special attention has been paid to the international tradition (in particular toward Panizzi's rules). After describing the relationships among the international trends and the Italian codes of 1922, 1956, and 1979, the paper deals with the recent works of the new Commission that, since 1997, has started to revise RICA. The paper concludes by reflecting on the Italian position in the debate first on the ISBD and then on the new entity-relationship models. doi:10.1300/J104v44n01\_09 [Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <docdelivery@haworthpress.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2007 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]

**KEYWORDS.** Italian cataloguing rules, RICA, cataloguing history, Paris Principles, international cooperation

### **FOREWORD**

Several countries that believe in international cooperation have long ago taken to sharing their cataloguing principles, re-examined their national traditions, and tried to harmonise their codes. This tradition, started by the 1961 Paris International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (ICCP), first with its *Statement of Principles*, then with the construction of new national codes, continues to become stronger and stricter. Many feel that there is a current need to redesign those principles with features more suitable to the new technological advances and to the international environment. Many also assert firmly that the highest principle is the convenience of the catalogue users.

This paper will present briefly the main activities aimed at a revision of the Italian code—*Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori* (RICA)—and how the international debate has influenced this code.

### **THE ITALIAN TRADITION**

In 1869, soon after the unification of Italy, the Commissione Cibrario<sup>1</sup> recommended in its final report that every library have a gen-

eral inventory, an author/title catalogue, and a subject catalogue. It also suggested that:

in order to insure [ . . . ] uniformity in the construction of these catalogues, each librarian will state special rules to be followed by the staff assigned to compiling and copying them. For the fulfilment of this task, it recommends librarians to consult Panizzi's rules for the printed catalogue of the British Museum, *Lecture di Bibliologia* by Tommaso Gar, the handbooks on librarianship by Petzholdt, Seizinger, and Edwards as well as the most important printed catalogues by Brunet, Graesse, etc.<sup>2</sup>

The first complete Italian code of rules was written by Giuseppe Fumagalli, based on his own experience and on the in-house code at the National Library in Florence. Published in *Cataloghi di biblioteca e indici bibliografici*,<sup>3</sup> it was awarded a prize by the Ministry. The gratifying verdict voiced by the judging committee is confirmed by the later debate in which this work is considered an irreproachable touchstone.<sup>4</sup> Fumagalli wrote: "The alphabetical author catalogue [ . . . ] is no doubt the most useful one in a library [ . . . because] it informs, as quickly as possible, *if a given book is in the library* and where it is; but it also provides the materials for studies in bio-bibliography; that is, it tells us *which works the library has by a given author and which editions of a given book*."<sup>5</sup> The excerpt shows that Fumagalli had learned well Cutter's lesson so much so that he fixes the principles of the author/title catalogue in the same terms in which they will be stated, over seventy-five years later, in the Paris Principles.<sup>6</sup>

The first Italian rules as a national standard for descriptive cataloguing go back to 1922 when a special commission was established whose members were the heads of two honoured libraries (Guido Biagi, chair, and Giuliano Bonazzi), a supervisor from the ministry, and a university professor; its task was to analyze the rules in use in many Italian libraries and to construct a code, with the similar Anglo-American code as model, to be used in all Italian state libraries. When the special commission ended its work, a decree ratified and promulgated the first national cataloguing code *Regole per la compilazione del catalogo alfabetico* (Roma: Nardecchia, 1922). The code mirrored the need for uniformity at the national level of the alphabetical catalogue and for an end to the numerous local solutions, mainly of a practical nature. Its success is proved by its widespread application even beyond the state libraries for which it was devised.<sup>7</sup>

The 1922 rules, when put to use under the supervision of Giuliano Bonazzi in the retrospective cataloguing of the bibliographic materials in the Rome library “Vittorio Emanuele II,” showed gaps stemming from two classes of problems: (1) some rules allowed for subjective interpretation; (2) some bibliographic cases were not to be found in any of the rules.

As far back as 1940, these shortcomings suggested the need for a revision or even a remaking of the 1922 rules so that a Commission of experts was appointed; but its work was interrupted by World War II.

In January 1951, with the spur of the recently started union catalogue of Italian libraries, a new commission<sup>8</sup> resumed the revision with two basic objectives:

1. to attune, as far as possible, the Italian rules to a type of international entry that would allow a foreigner to find easily the books searched in the alphabetical list of our catalogues;
2. “to rid the code of the dissimilarities and contradictions already found in it, to search for other ones, to broaden the rules according to a number of case studies greatly increased in twenty years of usage, in some cases to modify the form of the rules in order to make them less concise and more comprehensive and expansive, and, most of all, to increase the number of examples making them fit for current times.”

During its deliberations, the Commission kept in mind the 1949 ALA Code, the rules adopted in Belgian and German libraries, and the 1939 rules of the Vatican Library. It noted, “sometimes with real satisfaction, that the construction of some of these rules adopted in foreign countries was motivated by the corresponding rules in the Italian code.”<sup>9</sup>

The new cataloguing code, though it changed the rules in the 1922 code in many points, retained its structure;<sup>10</sup> in fact it neither increased nor decreased the number of rules. When we compare it to the 1922 code, the most relevant changes are:

1. works written even by two authors only, each one of whom wrote a clearly distinct and openly stated part, are to be entered as anonymous works with analytical entries for both authors (rule 18);
2. in publications for weddings, graduations, veil-takings, etc., refer from the names of the persons being celebrated (rule 19);

3. for works accompanied by a critical essay with its own title and sometimes in a separate volume, an analytical entry is made from the critical essay (rule 28);
4. for opera librettos refer from the title and the musician (rule 32);
5. for collections of writings taken from works by two or three authors, the main entry is made for the first; and analytical entries or reference entries are made for the others (rule 33);
6. a collection of inscriptions made by an author as a single and limited work that later becomes the starting point for a large collective publication must have a separate entry under its collection title (rule 34);
7. translations from various authors are treated according to the individual case, like collections or like works by different authors (rule 36);
8. rules and examples have been introduced for antipopes and patriarchs (rule 44) and for the wives of sovereigns (rule 45);
9. the rule for sovereigns who wrote in various languages has been changed, or rather inverted; the entries for the works by heads of state in the Renaissance and by Roman emperors have been regulated (rule 45).<sup>11</sup>

One last important change concerns the rules for corporate bodies: “the various forms of the name of academies and societies appear each one under its own denomination and not all under the last name; the various denominations are gathered in a chronological order in a general explanatory entry located before the group of entries with the last denomination” (rule 65).<sup>12</sup>

To note a peculiar detail, the code contains the use, ahead of the Paris Principles, of the phrase “main entry” for the entry with a full definition of the work. This “main entry” consists of, besides the entry word, four elements: (1) title; (2) imprint; (3) bibliographical notes; and (4) special notes.<sup>13</sup>

The element of change introduced by the 1961 Paris Conference was no doubt the main reason behind the revision leading to the publication of RICA in 1979. When the Italian delegation to Paris came back to Italy, it was convinced that the 1956 text had to be revised. Diego Maltese, from the National Central Library in Florence, backed the importance of an overall rethinking of the Italian code to bring it to a “consistent system of basic, clearly stated principles.”<sup>14</sup> The Italian code—though with a tradition going back to Cutter<sup>15</sup> and enriched with contributions by Fumagalli, Chilovi, and Biagi—needed a complete har-

monization of the rules, that is, a close examination of each rule (according to Lubetzky's model) that could relate the rule to a principle justifying its presence.

In 1962 at the XIX Congress of the Italian Library Association, "the suitability of drawing up a new edition of the rules" founded on the Paris Principles was recognized. After a debate in the library journals, a ministerial Commission was appointed in 1968.<sup>16</sup>

The theoretical foundations of the new cataloguing code had been stated earlier by Maltese in 1965 with the publication of "Principi di catalogazione e regole italiane" and then in 1966 in the work "Elementi di catalogazione per autori. Scelta e forma dell'intestazione."<sup>17</sup> Reviewing the former, Carlo Revelli, co-leader in the debate on the new principles and on the revision of the Italian rules, wrote: "In Italy the times are ripe for a radical revision of the rules for descriptive cataloguing [ . . . bringing us in line] with the revision movement taking place almost everywhere. [ . . . ] I can't see any better starting point than this work by Maltese that deserves due consideration."<sup>18</sup>

The latter contribution by Maltese stressed the need to separate the problems linked with the choice of headings and the ones linked with the form of it, thus setting the basis for a division that would represent the structural innovation of the new code.

Maltese's commitment to the design of the new code based on the Paris Principles and his "on principle" plan appeared in a letter he wrote to A. H. Chaplin after the publication of the provisional edition of the comments on the Paris Principles. Maltese remembered:

as early as the Rome session of the IFLA council [ . . . ], I voiced my doubts about the expediency of an "official" comment to the Paris Principles; from experience, I also advised against the unavoidable fallacy of examples [ . . . ]. I don't want to say that the Anglo-American code will not carry considerable weight in cataloguing practices all over the world (the ALA code carried it too), but what use was it, then, constructing principles, what use our thinking in preparation for them, let's say, from Osborn to Lubetzky (and to Chaplin), if certain compromising, perhaps inevitable, solutions take their place and are fully sanctioned?

Arthur Hugh Chaplin reaffirmed the concept that principles are international but that languages are national; principles must be suited to the culture and to the national language, that is, to local realities.

The *ad hoc* ministerial Rules Commission was created in 1968.<sup>19</sup> Since its members had their work obligations, they met only when possible. Much of the work was carried out by mail. Maltese, who was the chairman, shouldered the burden of collecting and abstracting the papers so that they could discuss matters more efficiently when they met. In April 1969, to confirm the strictly theoretical plan intended for the work, Revelli wrote to Maltese: “Dropping rules based on individual cases in favour of rules based on general principles forces the cataloguer to give up a *forma mentis* that tends to subdivide works by category of publication with the outcome that, with the growth of categories, solutions become more and more entangled.” The proposal tended to get rid of adherence to laws and cases in keeping with the suggestions made by Osborn and Lubetzky even though this implied a conflict at every step between adherence to the Italian rules and obedience to the Paris Principles. The most strongly debated issues were:

1. *Choice and form of headings*. The rules introduced the division between choice and form of heading (not of entry word) that was already, but not systematically, present in the 1956 rules.
2. *Name of author*. The Commission introduced a break in the Italian tradition that carefully searched for the author’s register name; it also considered and accepted the name on the document since it is the one looked for and preferred by the reader or at least by some readers.
3. *Jurisdictions*. The rules dropped the heading under bodies that are organs of governing-territorial jurisdictions in favour of a heading directly under the superior body of which they are organs. The rules kept the headings under those bodies—universities and libraries—that are not decentralized or peripheral organs of jurisdictions.
4. *Description*. The Commission gave much prominence to description—that is one of the great innovations in the new code—even more so than the rules for choice and form of heading that have always been issues treated in rules on author cataloguing. Description has a specific chapter, analogous with the space allotted to this subject by the 1967 AACR. The Commission took its start from a previous, rather generic, normative situation but could rely on the experience at BNI that provided an in-house descriptive code borrowed from the Library of Congress praxis (use of paragraphs, tracings, etc.).”<sup>20</sup>



In its research and synthesis, the Commission “paid particular attention to developments and new solutions to cataloguing issues world-wide. First the Anglo-American cataloguing rules, then the German ones were carefully studied but perhaps the Commission appreciated best the documents from the work of the IFLA Cataloguing Committee, especially *ISBD (M) International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications*, the standard for descriptive rules. The Commission did not, however, forget the Italian tradition.”<sup>21</sup>

Besides a general reorganisation of the structure of the code (“as a distribution of the discipline according to old criteria looked unfeasible”<sup>22</sup>), a first relevant innovation introduced by RICA was the concept of *the author presented as the main one*, that is, the author presented on the title page as prominent above the other authors in collective works. The rule implied that in these cases the choice of heading falls on a given entity, not by means of an analysis of the relationship between the entity and the work, but on merely formal criteria (or rather the form in which the information appears in the *manifestation*). Another change introduced—also regarding the choice of heading—was the suppression of paragraph 18, comma 3: “according to it a work written jointly was always entered under the title when the parts of the single authors appeared separate even if the authors were fewer than four. This rule, anyway, was a much debated innovation if compared with the 1921 rules.”<sup>23</sup>

The decision to prefer entry under title for collections of texts by various authors was an attempt to reconcile the Paris Principles and the Italian tradition by thus reading in a more limiting sense the words in section 10.3 of the Principles. The analysis of the concept of work and of its logical and consistent use in RICA made by Alberto Petrucciani pointed out that the terms work, publication, and edition are used inaccurately as quasi-synonyms although they are not at all such.<sup>24</sup>

The most interesting paragraphs on choice of heading were the ones about works by corporate bodies. The Paris Principles talked about “entries under corporate bodies,” a wording, adopted in spite of opposition to entry under corporate bodies strongly voiced by some participants. Avoiding calling them “authors” was done to satisfy these critics. In the RICA introductory *Report*, the treatment of corporate bodies was defined as “the most sensitive of all issues in descriptive cataloguing.” The 1956 rules, according to the Commission, were especially unsatisfactory because they accepted the principle of corporate bodies as authors but lacked a definition for corporate body and for body as author “so that every cataloguer had a personal idea of what collective authorship under a corporate body might mean.”<sup>25</sup>

The Italian tradition stood out for its appeal to the concept of “corporate body author,” already used by the in-house rules in use in 1881 at the National Central Library in Florence. Retaining the concept of “corporate body author,” RICA moved away from the content of the Paris Principles. “Therefore, the solution in RICA is outside the choice mandated by the Paris Principles about the treatment of corporate bodies even though the prescriptions look consistent and reaffirm the tradition recorded within the in-house rule at the National in Florence since 1881 and rule 49 in *Cataloghi di biblioteche e indici bibliografici* by Giuseppe Fumagalli.”<sup>26</sup>

Regarding the form of heading, the need to ensure that an author is uniformly identified and qualified when it is strictly necessary to distinguish him/her from another author suggested as a general rule to make the form of heading match “the one chosen by the author for his/her own publications or the one by which the author is best known.” This solution for the problem follows the principle of adopting a uniform heading; that is, to fix the unique and univocal form of name and of title so that all manifestations of an author’s works are collocated in one point in the catalogue (the second function of the catalogue, stated at 2.2a of the Paris Principles). The problem was divided into three points:

1. which name or which title to use;
2. which form of the name or which form of the title to use, choosing either a fuller or a less complete form;
3. for personal authors with a name made up of more than one word, which entry word to adopt; that is, which access element to put first, choosing either a direct form or some inversion or rotation of terms.<sup>27</sup>

The general criterion proposed at point 7 of the Paris Principles pointed to the name (or form of name) or title most frequently used in the original editions of the works or, if this principle cannot be applied, in references to them in accepted authorities. From a full reading of points 7 and 8 of the Paris Principles, we can infer that the choice must fall on “*the name most frequently used in the original language of the catalogued works.*” This solution implied collating the editions in the original language of the works—not directly, of course, but by means of accepted authorities—to establish and adopt the most recurrent form with the possibility of adopting a form based on translations only if the original language is not used in the catalogue.

Point 8.21 introduced yet another exception—the form that has become established in general usage—which makes for three criteria, not always in agreement but rather often antithetical, for adopting a uniform heading:

1. the form by which the author is most frequently identified in editions of his works even though this is difficult to establish so that the principle may vary from one library to another;
2. the form most frequently occurring in critical and reference works; and
3. the form established in general usage.

Almost forty-five years after the *Paris Principles*, we note that the results were positive about the choice of heading but not about its form; for the latter, each code followed its own particular course, mostly retaining local tradition.<sup>28</sup>

Going back to RICA, the Commission, although in its closing session, voiced the wish that “others will go on and construct rules for special materials and that a commentary will be started on the rules themselves that might become a useful aid.” A commission to revise and update RICA was delayed until 1996 when the October 1996 decree officially appointed the “Commission for updating and eventually simplifying the rules for constructing the alphabetic catalogue in Italian libraries,” a title that echoes the words for the 1956 rules, not for the 1979 ones.

### ***THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSIONE RICA AND THE DEBATE IN ITALY BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES***

The Commission—commonly called Commissione RICA—was appointed in order to “re-examine analytically the text of the Italian rules for descriptive cataloguing and to check, over twenty years after publication, whether they actually conform to the evolution of cataloguing praxis around the world, to the electronic environment in which we now work, and to the new types of materials ever more present in our libraries.”<sup>29</sup> Therefore, it is clear that the activities of the Commission would take place on two levels, though proceeding simultaneously: on an international level and on a national level, with a constant eye on conformity to the electronic environment. The Commission stated its target to

be a thorough study of: (1) the rationale for a possible re-writing of the code; (2) the effectiveness of the Paris Principles; (3) the need to update terminology and examples; (4) whether RICA can be used for other types of materials.”<sup>30</sup>

The Commission began an analysis, ended in 1997, according to which it considered substantially valid the Paris Principles that are the foundation of RICA. It also saw fit to broaden and develop the text of RICA by taking into account standards and documents produced internationally: ISBD, *Guidelines for Authority Records and References*, FRBR, FRANAR/FRAR, and ISO norms. The paramount aim of the revision was to harmonize the rules to the changed context in the organization of the catalogue, to the use of electronic technology, to the presence of new physical formats and different access modes, to the development of shared cataloguing, and to the implementation of cataloguing levels of varying complexity. After a first pause for evaluation offered by the workshop *La catalogazione verso il futuro*,<sup>31</sup> the Commission stated that the Paris Principles were still the basic principles although, as early as 1998, various cataloguing agencies had spoken in favour of replacing them and in the same year IFLA published FRBR, *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*, that offered a new approach to the analysis of the bibliographic record. The direction has not changed in the two last years. ICCU took part officially in the Frankfurt IME ICC meeting and translated the text of the International Cataloguing Principles that began focusing on the need to go beyond the Paris Principles and to replace them with new principles:

Over forty years later, having a common set of international cataloguing principles has become even more desirable as cataloguers and their clients use OPACs (Online Public Access Catalogues) around the world. Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, an effort has been made by IFLA to adapt the Paris Principles to objectives that are applicable to online library catalogues and beyond. The first of these objectives is to serve the convenience of the users of the catalogue. The new principles replace and broaden the Paris Principles and form an entry to all aspects of the bibliographic and authority records used in library catalogue.<sup>32</sup>

On the assumption that the Paris Principles were still valid, the Commission RICA deemed it necessary to make gradual changes in the codes that may tend to harmonize rather than to re-write. The codes should envisage the possibility of “varying levels of cataloguing, even

if a minimum amount of data and needed information must be retained,”<sup>33</sup> and should provide explanations on controversial issues: treatment of corporate bodies, form of transliterated names, the concept of intellectual responsibility, retrieval function versus bibliographic function, form of access, terminology, and abbreviations. In 2004, the Commissione RICA, on the basis of these guidelines, published a document on the form of heading for personal authors. A draft was distributed at the beginning of 2004 for preliminary verification and to gather the opinions of the library community on the proposed text. On November 13, 2004, an important response was prepared by the AIB Commission on Cataloguing and Indexing. A new version, updated to December 21, 2004, was published by ICCU; it looked more substantial and better defined (available at [http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/Forma\\_intestazione\\_Autore\\_personale.pdf](http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/Forma_intestazione_Autore_personale.pdf) (accessed February 15, 2006)).

The Commission stuck to the principle of establishing the rules in a logical, progressive, and consistent order by putting first a general rule on uniform heading followed by the rules on personal names and names of corporate bodies.

The main controversial issues in this draft dealt with: (1) separate “bibliographic identities” for the same person, (2) the preference between the original forms and forms in the language of the catalogue, and (3) keeping or dropping rules on categories and traditional exceptions.<sup>34</sup> On point 1, the Commissione RICA decided to retain the solution of the Paris Principles adopted by RICA; according to it, “a person, even when he/she changes name or uses different names in diverse occasions or for works of different genre, is always represented by one heading.”<sup>35</sup> The Commission considered bibliographic identities unfeasible and decided that, theoretically, the concept of separate “bibliographic identities” seemed inconsistent.”<sup>36</sup>

Point 2 in the proposed draft “restated the solution adopted by the Paris Principles and RICA: according to it, a uniform heading is normally based on the original form of the name, the one used in the publications in the original language rather than in translations or adaptations that may exist in the language of the catalogue or in a preferred “common” language. (Latin for the ancient and medieval world, English in some cases nowadays.)” The Commission, although it recognized the choice selected, even after the Paris Principles, by AACR and by the Spanish code as well as “the trend to give preference to translated or adapted forms that may seem more convenient for readers who have the use of translations, [ . . . ], also noticed that the trend towards a multicultural and intercultural society and the increasing global availability on-

line of bibliographic data should purport an increased preference for the original form.” On point 3, the goal has been to reduce exceptions or “to drop minor exceptions and to gather similar issues so as to get a simpler, clearer, and more consistent picture.”<sup>37</sup>

Besides the workshop on “Cataloguing towards the future,” there were two other important occasions for a debate on cataloguing rules: the AIB meetings in Genoa (1998) and Rome (1999). The Genoa Meeting represented a turning point. In a session openly devoted to *Il codice desiderato* [*The wished for code*],<sup>38</sup> several scholars declared their wish to modify RICA because the code needed updating, as asked for and hoped for by the Commission itself at the end of its sessions, in order to make it more adequate to the new evolving national and international context. In Rome, a full session was devoted to *La revisione dei codici di catalogazione: un punto di vista europeo* [*The revision of the cataloguing codes: a European point of view*]<sup>39</sup> with the objective of discussing a question that is fundamental, as it also is for many European countries especially the ones in central Europe, on the threefold options for the revision of the Italian code:

1. to construct a new code (but, on what principles?);
2. to translate the Anglo-American code (and to adopt it *sic et simpliciter*?);
3. to graft the national tradition, if it exists, on to the roots of AACR2 (as the Spaniards did in 1995).<sup>40</sup>

The debate on the revision of the various national codes and the attention paid to the international situation has never lagged in Italy; on the contrary, some clues might make us see a sort of international parallel tradition that began in the eighties. In those years, AIB promoted the translation and dissemination of ISBD, *International Standard of Bibliographic Description*;<sup>41</sup> the standard largely took root in our libraries thanks to the great number of training courses carried out during that period. The widespread knowledge of ISBD caused the progressive but inevitable substitution (*de facto*, never officially admitted) of RICA *Parte III. Descrizione* by the appropriate ISBD.<sup>42</sup>

In 1997, AACR2R was translated into Italian.<sup>43</sup> At the same time, cataloguing terminology was studied carefully, most of all when translating IFLA standards and Dewey, so that new concepts could be rendered correctly in Italian. These efforts have brought important, innovative changes into the Italian professional vocabulary. This fact brings to light a relevant part of the history of library science yet to

be analyzed and described. In recent years, Italy has constantly taken part in international meetings and has shown a slow, tireless, and qualified increase in its contribution to the theoretical debate with a twofold aspect: (1) direct participation in international events with papers presented at IFLA meetings and essays published in scholarly journals like the *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*—a journal that recently published the proceedings of the 2003 conference on authority control in Florence;<sup>44</sup> and (2) the debate on the same issues in meetings organized by universities, ICCU, AIB, and other institutions with the participation of Italian scholars in the preparation of the draft and then in the revision of the text of the international cataloguing principles (IME ICC).

After the publication of FRBR, for instance, the AIB study group on cataloguing published an important contribution<sup>45</sup> that was highly valued at an international level. The Commissione RICA published a study: *L'applicazione del modello FRBR ai cataloghi: problemi generali e di impiego normativo*.<sup>46</sup> The essay by Isa De Pinedo and Alberto Petrucciani, titled *Un approccio all'applicazione del modello FRBR alle regole di catalogazione italiane: problemi e possibili soluzioni*, started a national debate on the possible use of FRBR in the construction of the Italian code. Several Italian scholars took part in this debate.<sup>47</sup>

The prompt dissemination of the new model provided by FRBR was due both to the translation of the *Report* by ICCU and to the presence of a favourable climate open to new solutions, no doubt thanks to the diffusion all over Italy of SBN (the National Library Service) in which the entity/relationship model was developed from the start in a consistent and convincing way. AIB has contributed to moving in this direction; its cataloguing and indexing section has produced a document that studied the draft handed out by the Commissione RICAn.<sup>48</sup> The document presented some important general observations followed by specific comments on each proposed rule. The AIB Cataloguing and Indexing Section pointed out a serious critical problem in the general structure of the study by the Commissione RICAn. The draft on the form of personal name cited FRBR and the revision work by IME ICC; however, the continuous, repeated reference to the Paris Principles, motivated by the RICA tradition, did not make clear what the relationship is between the layout of the future Italian code and the principles being completed at the international level. Since IME ICC is preparing a document that, according to its editors, will fully replace the Paris Principles, it is not clear what the relationship will be between the draft by the Commissione RICA and the construction of the new principles.



In other words, there is a risk that the new Italian code, when published, will be already outdated and obsolete because of its “unwavering” foundation on the Paris Principles if its editors do not take into due consideration the replacement of the Paris Principles by the ones that will be probably be titled IFLA Cataloguing Principles. Furthermore, the new Italian code should better study the distinctive features of the electronic catalogue and the online environment in which catalogues operate nowadays. It should also take care in regards to the recognition of the electronic medium as the preferred form for the creation of catalogues as well as the relationship between entities and the resulting structure of data.

Of course, the fact that we are dealing with a draft, that up to now the analysis has been limited to a single feature—uniform heading for persons—that the layout of the code may follow a structure that makes it insert the general purpose rules at the beginning, suggests a temporary softening of the authors’ judgment about the substantial distance from the international context. It may be advisable to delay final evaluation until the complete draft is available. In any case, we want to highlight at least two far from irrelevant issues:

1. The stance taken by the Commissione RICA on “multiple bibliographic identities” can be fully accepted, particularly in the light of the Italian bibliographic tradition. Yet, we cannot hide the fact that the principle contradicts itself in the case of collective pseudonyms (the *see* reference from the personal name to the collective pseudonym for co-authored works is a *de facto* recognition of a different bibliographic identity);
2. With regard to the form of name, there are two possible approaches that are antithetical but forced to coexist: the original form of name and common usage. RICA, AACR2, and other codes show that they had the same problem in mind during code creation. According to the AIB Cataloguing and Indexing Commission, it must be admitted that “the original form is, on the whole, to be preferred because it seems philologically the most correct solution and because, for modern authors, it widely corresponds to the linguistic usage prevailing in Western countries (it is the name by which the author is known in the language of the bibliographic agency). Yet it may be inappropriate to make the use of the original form absolutely mandatory by enlarging its range to



cases in which it does not correspond to linguistic usage.” In fact, if we consider only one approach to form, we risk creating solutions hard to share, like suggesting as original form a transliterated form or forcing the user to know the original form of Confucius or Averhoës in old Chinese or in Arabic.

Even more so, where will someone look for a work published not only in Japan or in Egypt, but also in Norway or Denmark, if it has been indexed under its original name? Under what name are geographical areas indexed since an authority record is the same in a search by author and in one by subject? We must not forget, with regard to this, the work by IFLA—not so far back in time as to deserve oblivion—on names of corporate bodies (*Form and Structure of Corporate Headings*—FSCH, 1980) and on names of persons (*Names of Persons*): “The activity for names of persons is carried out with a totally different point of view. IFLA decides not to normalize or, rather, not to give general guidelines on how to treat names of persons in the cataloguing rules, but to collect and codify the [existing] bibliographic custom.” The outcome is that two publications “have similar objectives but are carried out following different notions. *Form and Structure of Corporate Headings* (FSCH) represents an international agreement edited by experts in the field. *Names of persons* enumerates national practices regarding the structure of personal names. Both methods can be justified, but obviously the results are not uniform.”<sup>49</sup>

The document by the AIB Cataloguing and Indexing Commission goes on to state:

In the choice between original form and linguistic usage, adopting the latter as preferred standard would lead, in many cases, to the use of the original form as preferred form but it would offer the advantage of avoiding the use of made-up or artificial forms (like the transliterated ones, particularly from non-alphabetic scripts, e.g., Japanese), or wholly imputed to a very specialized context, therefore alien to the linguistic and literary habits of most users of the catalogue.<sup>50</sup>

On the other hand, the founding element of the new principles is to serve the convenience of the user who speaks the vernacular and in whose favour it seems not only useful but also proper to give preference to common usage rather than to the original form.

## CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we note that, overall, the development of the Italian rules follows a long tradition that has been able to sum up both international achievements and local specificity, albeit with a few contradictions. After the publication of RICA (1979), the lack of a permanent committee lead to a break in code revision as the need arose; we are now trying to make up for this break, a process that is not without delays and gaps. The objective is a code that can fit into the deep and safe channel of international cooperation and reconcile the local tradition with the need to harmonize with the international code of reference represented by AACR2. We consider the solution by the Spanish rules a very good one; before them, only Eva Verona with the Slavic code had succeeded in such a harmonization.

## NOTES

1. The article was planned together by both authors who are in agreement on its total contents. Nevertheless, Carlo Bianchini is more responsible for Section 1 while Mauro Guerrini is more responsible for Section 2.

2. The Commissione Cibrario, officially known as "Commission on the scientific and disciplinary reorganization of the libraries in the kingdom," was instituted by the Ministry for Learning by the 20 July 1869 decree. Its task was to investigate the state of library services in Italy and to write a report whose outcome was the 24 November Royal Decree that, among other things, reorganized library services, established a new staff, classified libraries, and fixed the rules for admission to the training schools for librarians as well as the subjects in the curricula." See Attilio Mauro Caproni, "Virginia Carini Dainotti e il tema della formazione dei bibliotecari" in *Bollettino AIB*, vol. 39, n. 4 (dec. 1999), p. 436-442.

3. Giovanni Galli, *Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori tra Ottocento e Novecento*, Milano, Editrice Bibliografica, 1989, p. 49.

4. Giuseppe Fumagalli, *Cataloghi di biblioteca e indici bibliografici. Memoria di Giuseppe Fumagalli [. . .] premiata dal Ministero della istruzione pubblica nel 1° Concorso bibliografico*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1887.

5. Giovanni Galli, *Regole . . .*, cit., p. 59.

6. Giuseppe Fumagalli, *Cataloghi di biblioteca . . .*, cit., p. 116-117.

7. Galli remarks on the work of the famous Italian librarian: "*Cataloghi di biblioteca* is much more than a code to construct catalogues. If we agree that this activity is the heart of librarianship, we can state that the work by Fumagalli represents the start of the Italian librarianship not for its prescriptive content but for the way it organizes issues for its overall view of the object." (Giovanni Galli, *Regole . . .*, cit., p. 75).

8. The rules were organized as follows: Chapter I. On the catalogue and the entries; Chapter II. Entry word; Chapter III. The content of the entry; Chapter IV. Spelling and conventional signs. Appendix I. Incunabula.

9. The commission is made up of: Ettore Apollonj, chair; Nella Santovito Vichi, referent; Fernanda Ascarelli, Francesco Barberi, Marcella Bozza Mariani, Maria Marchetti, Emerenziana Vaccaro Sofia.

10. *Regole per la compilazione del catalogo alfabetico per autori nelle biblioteche italiane*, Roma, Fratelli Palombi, 1956, p. XI [from now onwards 1965]. The rules are signed by the commission members: Ettore Apollonj, chair; Nella Santovito Vichi, referent; Fernanda Ascarelli, Francesco Barberi, Marcella Bozza Mariani, Maria Marchetti, Emerenziana Vaccaro Sofia.

11. However, some appendices were added to the 1922 index: Appendix II. Geographical prints. Appendix III. Prints and Engravings. Appendix IV. Music. Appendix V. Transliterations. Appendix VI Abbreviations. Appendix VII Entry Arrangement. Analytical Index.

12. 1956 Rules, p. XII-XIII.

13. Ibid.

14. The 1956 Rules have a *Chapter I On the catalogue and the entries* that was a sort of glossary since it gave definitions for the basic concepts in the code. (i.e. Catalogue, alphabetical author catalogue, entry, entry word, author, anonymous works, title, etc.). The entries were classified as *main entries*, "the ones with a full description of a work"; *analytical entries*, "the ones for writings joined to another work or inside polygraphic collections"; see also references, "the ones that link a secondary author or title to the author or title in the main entry"; see *references* "the ones that simply refer from the form of an entry word to another." See the 1956 Rules, p. 1 and 2. See also RICA 139.

15. See Diego Maltese, "Contributo alla revisione delle Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori" in *Accademie e biblioteche d'Italia*, year 33, n. 4-5 (July-Oct. 1965), p. 283.

16. See Diego Maltese, "I principi internazionali di catalogazione" in *Accademie e biblioteche d'Italia*, year 30, n. 5-6 (Sept.-Dec. 1962), p. 258-269, particularly p. 268-269.

17. The events taking place between the approval of the Paris Principles and RICA are presented in Mauro Guerrini, "Il dibattito in Italia sulle norme di catalogazione per autore dalla Conferenza di Parigi alle RICA" in Id., *Riflessioni su principi, standard, regole e applicazioni. Saggi di storia, teoria e tecnica della catalogazione*, Udine, Forum, 1999, p. 45-92.

18. Diego Maltese, "Elementi di catalogazione per autori. Scelta e forma dell'intestazione" in *Accademie e biblioteche d'Italia*, year 34, n. 4 (July-Aug. 1966), p. 209-223. ID., *Principi di catalogazione e regole italiane*, Firenze, Olschki, 1965.

19. Carlo Revelli, Review in *Bollettino d'informazioni. Associazione italiana biblioteche*, year 6, n. 1 (Jan.-Feb. 1966), p. 23-32.

20. The Commission members are Francesco Barberi (chair), Diego Maltese (referent), Carola Ferrari, Carlo Revelli, Maria Valenti, Angela Vinay, and Giovannella Golisano (secretary); later two non-specialist university and library members were added: Maria Califano and Simonetta Nicolini.

21. Mauro Guerrini, "Il dibattito in Italia . . .," cit., p. 70.

22. *Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori*, Roma, ICCU, 1979, [from now onwards RICA], p. VIII.

23. RICA, p. IX.

24. RICA, p. XI.

25. Alberto Petrucciani, *Struttura delle norme di scelta dell'intestazione: le RICA e i nuovi modelli di analisi*, 2002, available on line at: <http://www.iccu.sbn.it/> (accessed February 15, 2006).

26. RICA, p. XII.

27. Mauro Guerrini, "Ente autore? Un concetto assente dai Principi di Parigi," box inside ID., "Il trattamento catalografico degli enti collettivi dalla Conferenza di Parigi (1961) al First IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (2003)," collaboration by Pino Buizza and Lucia Sardo, in *Biblioteche oggi*, year 21, n. 10 (Dec. 2003), p. 40; the full essay is on pages 37-53.

28. Mauro Guerrini, Pino Buizza, "Il controllo del punto di accesso alla registrazione per autore e titolo. Riflessioni sul comportamento delle principali agenzie bibliografiche nazionali a quarant'anni dai Principi di Parigi"; Paper presented at the workshop sponsored by ICCU, "Catalogazione e controllo di autorità, Giornate di studio," Rome, 21-22 novembre 2002. published in English as background paper, available on line at the IME ICC site: [http://www.ddb.de/news/ilfa\\_conf\\_index.htm](http://www.ddb.de/news/ilfa_conf_index.htm); presented in Spanish too at the 2004 Buenos Aires IME ICC2.

29. Mauro Guerrini, "La lingua del catalogo. Sulla forma del nome degli autori greci, latini, dell'oriente antico, del periodo medievale e umanistico, dei papi e dei santi," in Id., *Il catalogo di qualità*, Firenze, Regione Toscana Giunta Regionale, Pagnini e Martinelli, 2002, p. 51-85.

30. See <http://www.iccu.sbn.it/ricacom.html> (accessed February 15, 2006).

31. Ibid.

32. ICCU, *La catalogazione verso il futuro : normative, accessi, costi : Atti del seminario Roma, 13 marzo 1998*, Roma, ICCU, 1998.

33. See the Italian translation at the ICCU site: [http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/Traduzione\\_Principi.pdf](http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/Traduzione_Principi.pdf) (accessed February 15, 2006).

34. Cristina Magliano, "La Commissione RICA e la sua attività," 21 November 2002, available on line at: <http://www.iccu.sbn.it/ricaaf.html> (accessed February 15, 2006).

35. These themes had been dealt with and debated critically in Mauro Guerrini, *Riflessioni su principi, standard, regole e applicazioni*, cit, and in Id., *Il catalogo di qualità*, cit., two collections of essays previously published in several journals.

36. Commissione RICA, *Intestazione uniforme – Persone (testo aggiornato al 21 dicembre 2004)*, p. 1, available online at: [http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/Forma\\_intestazione\\_Autore\\_personale.pdf](http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/Forma_intestazione_Autore_personale.pdf) (accessed February 15, 2006).

37. Mauro Guerrini, Pino Buizza, "Il controllo del punto di accesso alla registrazione per autore e titolo," cit. hold the same opinion.

38. Ibid.

39. See MAURO GUERRINI, "Il codice desiderato. Verso RICA2? : evoluzione o rivoluzione?," in: *AIB 98. Atti del XLIV Congresso nazionale dell'Associazione italiana biblioteche*, Genova, 28-30 aprile 1998, by Fernanda Canepa and Graziano Ruffini, Roma, Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2001, p. 216-218; also available on line at: <http://www.aib.it/aib/congr/co98rica.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006).

40. See *AIB 99. Atti del XLV Congresso nazionale dell'Associazione italiana biblioteche*, Roma, 16-19 maggio 1999, by Enzo Frustaci and Mauro Guerrini, Roma, Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2001; also available online at: <http://www.aib.it/aib/congr/co99index.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006).

41. Mauro Guerrini, "La revisione dei codici di catalogazione: un punto di vista europeo. Nota introduttiva," in: *AIB 99*, cit., p. 82-83; also available on line at: <http://www.aib.it/aib/congr/co99guerrini.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006).

42. For ISBD translated into Italian, by AIB and later by ICCU, see <http://www.ifla.org/VI/3/nd1/isbdital.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006).

43. See Istituto centrale per il catalogo unico delle biblioteche italiane e per le informazioni bibliografiche, *Guida alla catalogazione nell'ambito del Servizio bibliotecario nazionale*, Roma, ICCU, 1987. The 1995 second edition is titled: *Guida alla catalogazione in SBN. Pubblicazioni monografiche, pubblicazioni in serie*. See the other guides published by ICCU and by other institutions.

44. *Regole di catalogazione angloamericane : seconda edizione, revisione del 1988*, redatte sotto la direzione del Joint steering committee for revision of AACR: the American Library Association, the Australian Committee on Cataloguing, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Library Association, the Library of Congress, a cura di Michael Gorman e Paul W. Winkler. Edizione italiana a cura di Rossella Dini e Luigi Crocetti, Milano, Editrice Bibliografica, [1997].

45. *Authority control in organizing and accessing information: definition and international experience*. Part I [and] Part II, Arlene G. Taylor, Barbara B. Tillett, guest editors, with the assistance of Mauro Guerrini and Murtha Baca, in "Cataloging & classification quarterly," vol. 38, nos. 3-4 (2004); vol. 39, nos. 1-2 (2004); also published as a monograph: New York, The Haworth Information Press, [2004]; the Italian version is edited by Mauro Guerrini and Barbara B. Tillett, with cooperation by Lucia Sardo, [Firenze], Firenze University Press; [Roma], Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2003).

46. AIB. Gruppo di studio sulla catalogazione, "Osservazioni su Functional requirements for bibliographic records : final report," *Bollettino AIB*, vol. 39, n. 3 (Sept. 1999), p. 303-311.

47. Cfr. <http://www.iccu.sbn.it/PDF/rica-frbr.pdf> [sic] (accessed February 15, 2006).

48. See Carlo Ghilli, Mauro Guerrini, Antonella Novelli, "FRBR: analisi del record e nuovi codici di catalogazione," *Bollettino AIB*, 43 (2002), 2 (June), p. 145-159.

49. See <http://www.aib.it/aib/commiss/catal/rica01.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006).

50. Mauro Guerrini, Lucia Sardo, *Authority control*, Roma, Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2003, p. 38.

51. Commissione, p. 3.