

In Praise of the Un-finished: the IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (2009)

Mauro Guerrini¹

Introduction

The *Paris Principles*, which was developed at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (ICCP), held in 1961 in Paris, dealt with the choice and form of entry in the author and title catalog. It resulted from a long work in making them which saw much discussion on first reports, on a draft of principles and during a preliminary conference. Seymour Lubetzky was entrusted by IFLA to develop new basic principles; these were discussed in the phase preceding the ICCP Conference.

The *Paris Principles* is the most relevant theoretical reference framework in the history of cataloguing in the second half of the twentieth century; it was taken

¹ Università di Firenze, Dipartimento di studi sul Medioevo e il Rinascimento, Piazza Brunelleschi 4 – 50121 Firenze; email: mauro.guerrini@unifi.it; guerrini.mauro@fastwebnet.it; sito web <<http://www.meri.unifi.it/CMpro-v-p-111.html>>. The Internet sites were last controlled on May 24, 2009. Carlo Bianchini, Pino Buizza, Agnese Galeffi, Giuliano Genetasio, Graziano Ruffini e Maria Enrica Vadala have read and commented on an intermediate version of this paper; I thank them for their kind help. I would like to thank Maria Letizia Fabbrini, who helped me in translating the article in English, and Dorothy McGarry, who revised it. A special thank to Barbara Tillett, who sent me many comments and suggestions.

as the basis for the codes developed worldwide from the mid-sixties, first of all the 1967 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR).

Besides Seymour Lubetzky, authoritative scholars like S.R. Ranganathan and Eva Verona contributed to the making of the *Paris Principles*; therefore, it is a milestone in the history of cataloguing and a great step forward in the standardization of cataloguing practice. As Buizza and Guerrini said in 2003, “Forty years later we find the *Paris Principles* had positive effects on the choice of headings but not on their form; each code followed its particular course, mostly retaining its local tradition.”¹

In 2001 Natalia Kasparova, of the Russian State Library and, at the time, member of the IFLA Cataloguing Section, suggested calling an international meeting to re-examine critically the *Paris Principles* and to broaden its scope to today’s issues.² This request was voiced by other librarians who felt it expedient – even needed – to revise it and to check whether it met the objectives and the structure of our present catalogues. The analysis dealt with various issues: the broader bibliographic universe, the greater variety of types of resources, the changes brought about by automation and informatics, the search modes and the languages used by readers who think and act globally, the need to avail of the same strategies to search OPACs, and the need for an architecture built on shared rules.

The analysis made clear the following points:

- The objectives of the new principles should be formulated in clear expressions, easily understood and valid everywhere for all types of resources, they should make it possible to work in the web, and be consistent with other rules for the description and access of resources.
- They had to mirror the *relational* structure of the catalogue, and to address primarily the various resources found in libraries and the electronic ones to which libraries provide access *via* the Internet, or other connecting modes. The text also had to cover both descriptive and subject cataloguing, to pay great attention to authority records and to deal not only with the collection of *one* library but virtually with the collections of *all* libraries and including the features of digital collections.

The principles should become an important reference tool for libraries and other international communities involved in organizing information. In other words the task was to develop and create new principles giving priority to the characteristics of all types of resources, physical and digital, and to how they are presented in a full-featured catalogue, not only in an author catalogue as the *Paris Principles*.³ Does the final result meet these needs and expectations?

The Paris Principles and the 2009 IFLA Statement of International Cataloguing Principles (ICP).

On February 27, 2009 the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* (ICP) was published online. On December 18, 2008 the “final text” was emailed to the participants of IME ICC (IFLA Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code), as well as to the members of the IFLA Cataloguing Section, Bibliography Section, and Classification and Indexing Section for last comments and final approval. The original text is available online, in English and in several translations at <http://archive.ifla.org/VII/s13/icp/> and a printed version will be available before the IFLA 2009 Conference in Milan.

The *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* (ICP) went through a shorter preliminary period than the *Paris Principles*, and a much longer process of development and adoption. It required strenuous work. The five-year IME ICC proceedings began in July 2003, were promoted and supported by the IFLA Cataloguing Section and, in turn, by several institutions in the countries where the five meetings took place. In each meeting, opinions were acknowledged and assessed against local traditions.⁴ The first meeting was held in Frankfurt, Germany, in July 2003;⁵ the following ones in Buenos Aires, Argentina (August 2004),⁶ Cairo, Egypt (December 2005), Seoul, South Korea (August 2006) and Durban, South Africa (August 2007). All the meetings (except Cairo) were held a few days before the annual IFLA Congress, and were attended by about fifty delegates at each meeting, with a sum of about 300 participants, members of national bibliographic agencies, national libraries, and cataloguing experts.⁷

Barbara B. Tillett (chair), Ana Lupe Cristán, Mauro Guerrini, Elena Escolano, and Jaesun Lee were permanent members of the IME ICC Planning Committee.⁸

At first, in 2003, some IME ICC members recommended a critical re-reading and integrating of the text of the *Paris Principles*, on the basis of some goals: to serve the convenience of the user, to provide consistent principles, to build on the conceptual models in FRBR and FRANAR; to include all kind of resources, to be compatible with OPACs and to encompass both authority control and subject cataloguing.

The *Introduction* in the final text of the ICP admits that IME ICC at first tried to “adapt the Paris Principles” but was later forced to change its objective and to create “a new statement” of principles. This change implies the realization that the scope and the theoretical background of the ICP are broader than those of the 1961 principles. The *Paris Principles* show a consistent and balanced framework therefore modifying their text would be very hard – perhaps impossible – without impairing that balance. Thus the *Introduction* in the 2009 *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* states: “Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, an effort has been made by IFLA to produce a new statement of principles that are applicable to online library catalogues and beyond.” The sentence, of course, means that the principles have been substantially updated; it implies that IFLA has developed new principles and

the 2009 *Statement*, “replaces” the *Paris Principles*, which are still an indispensable landmark for anyone interested in cataloguing.

That is one of the really novel features of the ICP: “This statement replaces and broadens the scope of the Paris Principles from just textual works to all types of materials and from just the choice and form of entry to all aspects of bibliographic and authority data used in catalogues.”⁹ The *Statement* “includes not only principles and objectives (i.e., functions of the catalogue), but also guidelines that should be included in cataloguing codes internationally, as well as guidance on search and retrieval capabilities.”¹⁰ As a matter of fact, note 1 of section 1 in the *Paris Principles, Scope of Statement*, read: “In this Statement, the word *book* should be taken to include other library materials having similar characteristics.”¹¹ The term *book* was to be understood in a broad sense and applied to other media, including any document that might be found in the library. The ICP is certainly more accurate when it states that it deals with “all the bibliographic resources”, but it does not introduce any substantial innovation with respect to what was declared, less openly, in the *Paris Principles*.

In short, the ICP, re-states the cataloguing principles in a perspective that puts the user in a central position and builds on the basis of the conceptual and linguistic models of FRBR (*Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*), FRAD (*Functional Requirements for Authority Data*) and FRSAD (*Functional*

*Requirements for Subject Authority Data*¹²). It also broadens its scope to authority data and to the foundations for search capabilities, focusing on the world of online catalogues, it helps as well “to plan systems that might take advantage, in the future, of the potential of such systems. The new systems offer much better tools to search resources and to navigate more efficiently the bibliographic universe.”¹³

The ICP objectives and the issues discussed

The ICP look back to the international cataloguing tradition – particularly to Charles Ammi Cutter, S.R. Ranganathan, Seymour Lubetzky – to the main theoretical models, FRBR and FRAD and, for the most recent – post FRBR – innovations, to Elaine Svenonius, in fact the text of the *Statement* is in debt to her for several points.

These were the topics dealt with at the international meetings – discussed in five working groups – whose members were, in turn, different experts: 1, Personal Names; 2, Corporate Bodies; 3, Seriality; 4, Multipart Structures; 5, Uniform Titles/GMD, General Material Designation. The relationship has been discussed, between FRBR and ISBD, as well as the role of the VIAF (Virtual International Authority File). Much work was devoted to the creation of the *Glossary* of cataloguing terms; the definitions in it underwent numerous changes.

The international meetings saw the emergence of some basic issues; particularly the western (European and North American) approach to cataloguing problems was fiercely criticized. A few examples: the western tradition indexes a work under its author's name while the eastern tradition gives prominence to its title; in the sub-Saharan area (and in other parts of the world) there are no official forms of name; in many cultures family names are absent; different scripts are used (alphabetic, ideographic, etc.). All this implies different treatments, and also different publishing traditions – for example the absence of a real title page in many Arabic and Eastern publications.

Analysis of the way the *Principles* was developed

The IME ICC Meeting in Frankfurt began with a “starter draft” entitled *Principles for Library Catalogues and other Bibliographic Files*, prepared by Monika Münnich, of the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, and Hans Popst, of the Fachbereich Archiv- und Bibliothekswesen of the Bayerische Beamtenfachhochschule, assisted by Charles Croissant of Saint Louis University.¹⁴ The draft was based on the *Paris Principles*, but adjusted to encompass bibliographic and authority data for all types of resource collected by libraries, archives, and museums, or to which these institutions provide access (remote electronic resources). The original text was divided into six sections, plus an *Appendix* containing the “Objectives.”

The development of the text went on until December 19, 2003, the suggestions proposed were collected, then a long and patient analysis followed and a complex re-working of the text, issued as *final draft* titled *Statement of international cataloguing principles*; it represented the first official outcome of IME ICC, though related only to the European survey.¹⁵

The December 19, 2003 text recorded relevant variations with respect to the original draft: the title was changed from *Principles for library catalogues and other bibliographic files* to *Statement of international cataloguing principles*. The change showed that there co-existed two opinions: the first one regarded the principles as aimed at controlling any type of bibliographic file, the second one that the use of the principles should be confined to the field of the cataloguing tools for libraries, although of interest to archives and museums, too. The original title focused on the *catalog*; the second one on *cataloguing*; two conceptually different approaches.

The structure of the ICP1 – *Introduction; Scope; Entities, Attributes and Relationships; Functions of the Catalogue; Bibliographic Description; Access Points; Authority Records; Foundations for Search Capabilities*, plus an *Appendix* containing the “Objectives” – was not changed until the draft of the ICP5 in Pretoria, South Africa, when the *Objectives* were moved from the *Appendix* to the text.¹⁶ In the September 2008 draft, the *Objectives* became *Principles*, and formed Section 2, while *Objectives and Functions of the*

Catalogue was moved before *Entities, Relationships, and Attributes*. The move of the *General Principles* from the Appendix to the text – one of the most relevant changes made during the five-year long debate – was proposed by the Italian participants.¹⁷ *Principles*, as stated by Elaine Svenonius (who organized them logically in *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization*), determine the formation and use of the cataloguing system, while *Objectives* regulate what a user can expect from it. The final text of the ICP reads: “Several principles direct the construction of cataloguing codes.¹⁸ The highest is the convenience of the user.”

The Conceptual Model

Section 3, *Entities, Attributes, and Relationships*, is another new element with comparison to the *Paris Principles*, which did not take the trouble to define openly the objects of cataloguing, confining the matter to naming a few in the section on the functions of the catalog: book, edition, work. This left some doubts and dubious interpretations. Some ambiguities in the use of *book*, *edition*, and *work* were spotted and corrected at the request of the IMCE (International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts, Copenhagen 1969), by Eva Verona in the annotated edition of the *Paris Principles*,¹⁹ and in the magisterial work by Ákos Domanovszky, *Functions and objects of author and title cataloguing*, that deals with the definition of the object of cataloguing in his interpretation of the *Paris Principles*.²⁰

The *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* openly says at paragraph 3.1, *Entities in the bibliographic records*: “The following entities may be represented by bibliographic and authority data: Work, Expression, Manifestation, Item,²¹ Person, Family, Corporate Body,²² Concept, Object, Event, Place.”²³ Therefore they fully assimilate and integrate the Entities in FRBR and in FRAD, even though at that time the text of FRAD was not yet published. It is worth marking out the changes in the title: at first FRANAR (*Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records*), later on FRAR (*Functional Requirements for Authority Records*), and then FRAD (*Functional Requirements for Authority Data*), where the focus is on organizing *data* instead of creating *records*.

A question discussed from the start – to which the ICP provide an answer – is how much FRBR affects catalogues. It was asked whether cataloguing rules reflecting the FRBR model should be re-written or FRBR was to be considered a conceptual model that cannot be reproduced *sic et simpliciter* in catalogues. Bringing the FRBR structure into the ICP makes for its annexation in the rules and in the catalogues; anyway, this aspect was never made completely clear. Patrick le Bœuf, the author of a critical survey of FRBR underlines the distinction between the aims of the FRBR conceptual model and the organization of the catalogue.²⁴ The title of the section, that shows its contents (*Entities, attributes, relationships*) instead of its theme (*the conceptual model of*

the bibliographic universe), may imply a rather mechanical adoption of the FRBR, not its integration in the principles.

The group of Italian experts tried in vain to change the title, first, in August 2006, to *Conceptual model of the cataloguing universe*, and then again in August 2007 to *Conceptual model*.

Paragraph 4, *Objectives and Functions of the Catalogue*, acknowledges that ICP is in debt to the FRBR report and to *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization*, whose functions it assumes. The *Statement* does not consider the broader *user tasks* in FRAD, maybe because FRAD was not yet completed but more likely because its functions have been considered too detailed. The *navigate* function, not present in FRBR (present *de facto* in the verb *relate*), taken from Svenonius, also suggested as a *fifth task* in the comment to FRBR by the AIB study-group on cataloguing (1999),²⁵ greatly improves the quality of the setting up of the present catalogue, which at last becomes free from the constraints inherited from the card catalogue (mechanically copied, perhaps inevitably at first, into the electronic catalogue) and takes its function, attuned to the web.

Section 4.4 saw another element of novelty that refers to the function *Obtain*, a completely new one for the principles and the codes. Actually, *Obtaining* a book, a resource has always been *the* function of the catalogue, but since the

mode of access and acquisition have greatly changed in the electronic catalogue, the need arises to specify that the catalogue must also inform the user on the modes of acquisition of the retrieved bibliographic resources.

Elaine Svenonius merged Cutter's *Objectives* and the *User-tasks* in FRBR, therefore she had to divide the function *Find* into two sub-functions (corresponding to the functions *Identify* and *Locate* in Cutter). It is a notable and brave choice but we may ask whether it is also right. We have the *objectives* of the catalogue on one side and a series of *tasks* the user can perform in it on the other side; they are conceptually different notions. The *Objectives* in Cutter are an essential component of the theoretical architecture of the catalogue while the *User-tasks* in FRBR are outside the model proper, they are needed to specify the relevance of the descriptive elements to be included in bibliographic and authority records.

Bibliographic Description

Paragraph 5, *Bibliographic Description*, was at the centre of a long debate about the object of the bibliographic record; the text in the December 2003 *Statement*, paragraph 2.1.1. said: "Bibliographic records typically reflect manifestations. These manifestations may embody a collection of works, an individual work, or a component part of a work. Manifestations may appear in one or more physical units." Patrick Le Boeuf, at IME ICC1, did not agree and declared that the records actually represent the item not the manifestation. His suggestion

was rejected by most participants who thought that an item, as representative of a manifestation, was the same as the manifestation with regard to its intellectual content and its physical form. This is what FRBR states: “Defining *manifestation* as an entity enables us to name and describe the complete set of *items* that result from a single act of physical embodiment or production. The entity *manifestation* serves to describe the shared characteristics of copies of a particular publication, edition, release, etc., as well as to describe unique productions such as manuscripts, original oil paintings, etc.”²⁶

The 2009 *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, point 5.2, instead says: “A bibliographic description typically should be based on the item as representative of the manifestation and may include attributes that pertain to the embodied work(s) and expression(s).” It is an extremely significant change. The description is based on the item but the bibliographic record – if produced by a national bibliographic agency – describes the item as a representative, as an *exemplum*, of the set of items from a single act of production, as it has always been stated by our modern cataloguing tradition.

We find no definite mention in the paragraph that the bibliographic description has the functions *characterize* and *identify* and the expected statement of its theoretical foundation is postponed again. The issue was debated at the 2008 meeting in Quebec City, during which it seemed that Lubetzky’s principles had been accepted, yet there is no trace of them in the final text.

The *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* is quite scarce on the topic of bibliographic description, Section 4 rules that: “Descriptive data should be based on an internationally agreed standard” and refers directly to the ISBD, cited in a note. Yet we may ask whether it is proper for principles to refer to a standard that is on a lower level, according to Michael Gorman’s characterization: principles, standards, rules, and applications. Perhaps this outcome is due to the state of uncertainty concerning the future of the bibliographic description and especially of the ISBD.

We must specify that the ISBD does not consist only in punctuation, it is not just a form of presentation of the elements or a visual display, and it must not be confused with it. Most of all, the ISBD provides data analysis, i.e., it instructs the cataloguer to search and recognize data, to define their functions within the specific context and to ascertain the proper position in which to record them within the pattern of the descriptive areas of OPACs that adopt ISBD. Even if punctuation is a relevant aspect of ISBD, it has a minor relationship to display issues. In fact, its most important function is to underline grammatical links among data elements and to clarify their logical position by presenting them in a specific, understandable, meaningful sequence. Only this function actually helps us to understand the real meaning of data elements beyond linguistic barriers.²⁷ The most important function of bibliographic analysis is to emphasize the relationships among attributes of the

resource and to allow to present them consistently in a logical, intelligible sequence of data.²⁸

Access Points

Section 6, *Access Points*, takes up a considerable portion of the ICP. Access points can be controlled or not controlled; the former guarantee the consistency needed for “collocating the bibliographic records for sets of resources.” (Note the use as synonyms of *Manifestation* and *Resource*, or rather, does the term *Resource* implicitly include work, expression, manifestation, and item?) Uncontrolled access points may be titles (e.g., the title proper as found on a manifestation) codes, keywords, etc., not controlled in authority records.

Paragraph 6.2.1. mentions “creators of works” and the following paragraph “Corporate body as creator”; we also find the term at 6.3.4.4., 7.1.2.1, and 7.1.3.1. In the *Glossary* the definition of *creator* is: “A person, family, or corporate body responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of a work.” We find the term *creator* in AACR2, not in any other code. The term *author* is not present in the text of the ICP and in the *Glossary*, where it only appears, cited within parentheses, to explain the function of: “A person (author, [...]) that has a role in the lifecycle of a resource.”²⁹ In the ICP, *author* has become *creator*, a more generic concept, less linked to the idea of a book, a concept we

find in the present North American cataloguing codes but absent in the European ones.³⁰

Paragraph 6.3.2 *Language and Script of Authorized Access Points*, repeats, with less accuracy, point 7 of the *Paris Principles*.³¹ The two different but overlapping principles, established by the ICCP in 1961, are not solved in the ICP:

1. information found on manifestations of the work expressed in the original language and script;
2. forms found in manifestations or in reference sources in one of the languages or scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.

This paragraph underwent many changes, and it was written over and over again; for instance it was debated whether to give prominence to linguistic traditions or to the country of origin when establishing the form of name.³²

A document by the AIB Cataloguing Committee dated November 2004 admits that the form of name in the original language is to be preferred, because it is the one philologically most correct, and because it agrees, for modern authors, with the use prevailing in the western hemisphere, being the name by which an author is generally known. Yet it might not be convenient to standardize the use of the original form and to apply it to cases in which it does not agree with the linguistic use. The risk is in having forms that are difficult to share, as

happens when it is suggested to take a transliterated form or when the user is expected to know the original form of Confucius or Averroes in ancient Chinese and in Arabic.³³

Paragraph 6.3.3.1, *Choice of Authorized Access Point for Person, Family, Corporate Body*, is another of the long debated points of the ICP. “If a person, family, or a corporate body uses variant names or variant forms of names, one name or one form of name should be chosen as the basis for the authorized access point for each distinct identity.” The *Statement* of the 2003 ICP used the term *persona*,³⁴ replaced with *distinct identity* in the final version. We are faced with the bibliographic identity problem introduced into the 1988 AACR2R (it was not in the 1987 AACR2). The term *family* makes clear the broader scope of the Principles that concern the requirements of archives where the name of a family is the main access point.

Section 6.3.4 has been slightly modified even in the final draft. The final version reads, at paragraph 6.3.4.4, *Form of Name for Works/Expressions*: “An authorized access point for a work, expression, manifestation, or item may either be a title that can stand alone or it may be a title combined with the authorized access point for the creator(s) of the work.” Previously, at 6.3.3.2, *Choice of Authorized Access Point for Work and Expression*, the ICP stated: “When a work has multiple titles, one title should be preferred as the basis for the authorized access point for the work/expression.”

Form of Name and of Titles

The *form of name for persons* (6.3.4.1) “when the name of a person consists of several words, the choice of first word for the authorized access point should follow conventions of the country and language most associated with that person, as found in manifestations or reference sources.” The same for corporate bodies, at paragraph 6.3.4.2. As observed by Creider: “The final solution dodged some old issues, such as the choice of first word for a controlled access point for a personal or family name and the preferred choice for the name of a work or expression. The issues may not be permanently resolved, but there was agreement on principles and room was left for different national and regional practices.”³⁵

The development of the principles on names and their forms has been long and full of knots. It seems the ICP did not undo the knots; they are much more indefinite than the *Paris Principles*, “charged” of being too detailed on this point, as if it was a cataloguing code. The experts who framed the ICP considered that controlling the access points in the digital universe does not require fixing a particular word sequence but, at the same time, they admit the need for an *authorized access point of name* as a default display form, if there is no other requested or specified.

The statement on *authority control* takes a fairly large part of the text. *Uniform title* is cancelled and replaced by *Authorized access point*, *Authorized form of name*, *Name*. The change is not just verbal, but conceptual. The old term *headings* is linked closely to catalogues, particularly those in book or card format, and was replaced by *access points* that may or may not be controlled and may consist of many elements that can be pre- or post-coordinated.³⁶

This differentiation seems to refer to the debate on the *deconstruction* of the catalogue.³⁷ Attention is focused neither on the catalogue itself nor on the bibliographic record with its distinction between access and description. The bibliographic record is seen less and less as a unit and more and more as a set of *data*, an aggregate of *data*. Maybe it is no longer needed, for example, it may be replaced by metadata embedded in the resource. Thus bibliographic data can be stored and re-composed in various modes. The use of data over record comes from the influence of FRAD and their recognition that data rather record as we know them today will evolve with technological advances.

Point 6.1 in semi-final versions of the ICP stated that: “Variant forms used as references had to be included with the authorized form.” It became, in the final text (6.1.1.1): “Authority records should be constructed to control the authorized forms of names, variant forms of name, and identifiers used as access points.” The introduction of identifiers is essential to accomplish an

international *authority system* like the one planned in VIAF and for easier machine-manipulation in an international arena.

The new concept of uniformity: the co-existence of a plurality of authorized access points

Uniform names and titles of works have always been a thorny issue in both bibliographic theory and practice; the issue has become more relevant because the uniform title, besides its function of collocating different editions of the same work, is used to distinguish different works, especially serials, published under the same title.

The IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN (International Standard Authority Data Number) has decided that it is not feasible to have all the bibliographic agencies in the world using the same access points. Therefore it considers obsolete the principle of a single, authorized, uniform heading in favour of one or more authorized access points for the same entity that are equally valid but each one attuned to different cultural and linguistic environments and established according to different rules. Their equal value on an international level has its equivalent in the *authority record* of each bibliographic agency that links its authorized form and the “parallel” authorized forms established according to different rules and related to other cultures and scripts. Thus the objective of linguistic uniformity on an international level is avoided and we have neither a single language nor

languages put side by side. Therefore, designing *access point control* implies the work of an interpreter who no longer has to formulate the right name (*authority*), in its precise form but can have the different names used (*authorized*) to interact. The user looking for a resource no longer has to “guess” the right name in its precise form but can search the catalogue according to the linguistic usage of his country, having at his disposal an “interpreter” who translates the query according to the various modes in the catalogue.³⁸

In fact the issue had already been dealt with in 1995 when the IFLA Section on Cataloguing realized that the bibliographic practice, in spite of the 1980 *Form and Structure of Corporate Headings* (FSCH),³⁹ showed no uniformity in the entries under corporate names. The new 2000 edition of *Structures of Corporate Name Headings*,⁴⁰ has, not incidentally, dropped the problem related to the form of names.

Although the ICP gives directives on when and how to construct authority records and access points, some problems have not yet been solved. The terminology wavers between granting priority to *record* (6.1.1.1, 6.1.2.1) or to *data* (4.4, 6.1, 6.3.3.1.2). This inconsistency shows an attempt at adjusting the terminology to a bibliographic world in transition. We find this hesitation between the principle of the original language and the principle of the convenience of the local user at 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.1.1. The choice of the

authorized access points (6.3.3), besides presenting again the inconsistency, seems to ignore the international developments in *authority control*, especially the possibility to have a numerical, not verbal, form of name, like the planned ISADN, a possibility, by the way, that was dropped by the FRANAR Working Group.⁴¹

The VIAF project is not mentioned in the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*.⁴² VIAF is a cooperative project by some great libraries (Library of Congress, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, National Library of Sweden, National Library of the Czech Republic, National Library of Israel, the Vatican Library, Bibliotheca Alexandrina, National Library of Portugal, National Library of Spain, National Library of Australia, ICCU), and OCLC's Research Office, presently in a beta version⁴³ that allows the *authority files* of the participant libraries to be searched simultaneously. The data in them are re-assembled by VIAF into super-records containing the authority records proper (in UNIMARC and MARC21 formats) and other data (selection of titles, country, publisher, etc.). VIAF does not construct access points nor is it a real *authority file*; rather, it is a device for connecting and displaying authority data that already exists. The project began in 2003 when it was realized - after the publication of *Mandatory data elements for internationally shared resource authority records*⁴⁴ – that the idea of a uniform heading accepted on an international level stated by the *Paris Principles* and by the UBC program (Universal Bibliographic

Control) in its original version had lost its validity. This is the most relevant change with respect to the *Paris Principles*. The present directive is for the choice of a cluster of headings, or to provide for the co-existence of a plurality of authorized headings. We see here the end of the time in which cooperation was based on the choice of an international uniform heading. Now the importance of the language of the catalogue – the language, or languages, of the bibliographic agency, and hence the users – is recognized and the user is made the focus of a catalogue that wants to be *user friendly*.

Foundations for the Search Function

Section 7, *Foundations for Search Capabilities*, provides directives for the modes by which catalogues meet research requirements. These directives have been considered improper in the context of a *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* concerning bibliographic principles. It might have been more correct to admit at the start, even in the title, the strong link between cataloguing and information retrieval, two complementary components of bibliographic access, and eventually discuss them side by side. At first the section also stated directives on modes of display for bibliographic information. This was not regarded as fitting for a text on cataloguing principles in spite of its relevance to the final selection of the means to meet the objectives.⁴⁵ This part, as observed by Laurence S. Creider, is the most tentative in the ICP and provides alternative versions of the subsection on essential access points and displays (7.1.2 and 7.3).⁴⁶ The matter of displays, he adds, even when limited

to online information, is still too variable and volatile for any useful principles to be prescribed.

After the first draft of the ICP1 (from the IME ICC1), the changes in the section were few. The most relevant one was, in section 7.1.2.2, the addition of “identifiers for the entity” in the essential access points in authority records. The concept of “physical medium” was split into “content type” and “carrier type.” These terms reflect vocabulary introduced in discussions with the publishing community and with the developers of RDA.

Retrieval became a new section, 7.2: “When searching retrieves several records with the same access point, records should be displayed in some logical order convenient to the catalogue user, preferably according to a standard relevant to the language and script of the access point.” The sentence asks for the catalogue to be able to fulfill the collocating function and to express FRBR relationships, but it also allows for different arrangements under subject terms (as chronological order), series (in numerical order), formats, etc. The displays in online catalogues do not always apply the principle of “convenience of catalogue users,” therefore this principle is welcome.⁴⁷

Considerations

The term *record* is dropped and *data* takes its place, in accordance with the latest American trends to move beyond the MARC format. Another vaguely

defined issue is the concept of “the convenience of catalogue users,” a much stressed but little explicated function. The text does not specify if it relates to “an international user” or to “a local user” and the two often have different needs.

The planned broadening of the scope of the catalogue to an integrated totality of access points and to search capabilities by author, title and subject was not fully accomplished. Although the ICP state at Section 1, *Scope* that the principles “aim to provide a consistent approach to descriptive and subject cataloguing of bibliographic resources of all kinds,” note 4, in section 2, *General Principles*, admits modestly that “With regard to subject thesauri, there are additional principles that apply but are not yet included in this statement.”⁴⁸ This is partly due to the lack of a cohesive international tradition for subject cataloguing and for the design of principles and codes for it to be compared to the tradition for descriptive cataloguing. Yet the work by the Classification Research Group, started in 1952, might have been a useful reference framework.⁴⁹ Even the theoretical investigation is somewhat scarce and goes no further than the inadequate statements in FRBR. Tom Delsey had started to develop some stirring thoughts – arousing hopes – in his paper titled *Modeling subject access. Extending the FRBR and FRANAR conceptual models*, prepared for the FRBR/CRM Harmonization Group and presented at a conference promoted by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in November 2003.⁵⁰ We base some expectations on the activities of the Working Group on

Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records (FRSAR), which plans to make available a draft of its final report in 2009.⁵¹ The treatment of subject cataloguing and of its principles – in spite of references to FRSAD and to the entities in group 3 of FRBR – is still absent in the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*; the statement does not even mention basic documents like *SHLs, Principles Underlying Subject Heading Languages*.⁵²

The *Glossary* was planned as an Attachment to the draft; its function was to make clear, pragmatically, the meaning of the terms and to help with their translation and dissemination in different national and linguistic contexts. While we may appreciate that during its development it was decided to make it an integral part of the *Statement*, we find the choice of terms in the *Glossary* rather feeble. The development of the *Glossary* should have taken the definitions already found in previous (not necessarily synchronous and consistent) documents by IFLA and other professional organizations – as was partially done – and analyse them against the new terms recently adopted in the literature, and their meanings (for instance *Resource*). This is in order to clarify them through a debate on the technical aspects of the principles and the functions of the catalogue, so as to define, or re-define, concepts and terms in a consistent and shared manner, and only then take the terms and their new meanings into the final text, granting that it would be homogeneous. A glossary built in this manner – we hope it will soon be defined – might be both

a preliminary statement and the final result of a work aiming at developing an international cataloguing code.⁵³

The move in the *Glossary* towards more generic terms in order not to confine its scope to books and libraries, broadening it to other institutions devoted to the preservation and access of recorded knowledge seemed inspired by a fear that keeping old terms (for example, *Heading*) might appear as lack of updating and therefore as inadequacy. Does the new terminology really imply a change in the bibliographic realm and its representation, or is it only appearance? The really relevant innovation in the ICP when compared to the *Paris Principles* is its broader attention to “all aspects of bibliographic and authority data used in library catalogues.”⁵⁴

Do our present catalogues really accomplish conceptual functions different from the ones documented by Charles A. Cutter in 1876? What is the relationship between the *Paris Principles* and the new ICP, or can we draw a continuous line linking the two texts? Can the ICP become a tool shared by all and the intellectual foundation on which to develop new cataloguing codes? Which cataloguing codes?

Since 1961, The *Paris Principles* has been a basic reference framework thanks to its inner consistency, even though it was confined to the choice and form of headings for authors. The aim of ICP was to encompass all aspects of

cataloguing praxis but actually, it has been unable to get beyond descriptive cataloguing and authority control, and has not dealt with subject cataloguing. Besides a few differences, there is a line of coherency, or evolution, between the *Paris Principles* and the ICP, and the latter's aim at representing a new and broader model of the bibliographic universe.⁵⁵ The ICP is built on a highly adaptable conceptual framework and has "employed the tremendous diversity of the library and information worlds, both physical and digital."⁵⁶

The new principles meet the needs of a world much changed since 1961, but they are still imperfect, like an *unfinished text*. Being aware of their imperfection we feel compelled to improve them. The *IME ICC Resolution*, at the end of the Statement, says: "We further recommend that the IFLA Cataloguing Section be charged to maintain the texts and to conduct a review of them at approximately 5 year intervals to update as needed in consultation with the larger information community." The review has already begun.

¹ PINO BUIZZA and MAURO GUERRINI, "Author and title access point control: on the way national bibliographic agencies face the issue forty years after the Paris Principles", in *IFLA cataloguing principles. Steps towards an international cataloguing code*, edited by BARBARA B. TILLET, RENATE GÖMPEL and SUSANNE OEHLISCHLÄGER, München: Saur, 2004, p. 72. Background paper presented at IME ICC1, Frankfurt, July 28-30, 2003.

² Cf. BARBARA B. TILLET, "RDA (Resource Description and Access): sviluppo di un nuovo codice di catalogazione internazionale", *Bibliotime*, 9 (2008), n. 1, <<http://www2.spbo.unibo.it/bibliotime/num-xi-1/tillett.htm>>.

³ Cf. CARLO BIANCHINI, PINO BUIZZA E MAURO GUERRINI, “Verso nuovi principi di catalogazione. Riflessioni sull’IME ICC di Francoforte”, *Bollettino AIB*, 44 (2004), n. 2, p. [133-152], later in MAURO GUERRINI, *Verso nuovi principi e nuovi codici di catalogazione*, with CARLO BIANCHINI, PINO BUIZZA, CARLO GHILLI, ANTONELLA NOVELLI, LUCIA SARDO, edited by CARLO BIANCHINI, with the cooperation of ROSSANO DE LAURENTIIS, foreword by ALBERTO PETRUCCIANI, afterword by PINO BUIZZA, Milano: Sylvestre Bonnard, c2005, p. 35-65.

⁴ A survey of the IME ICC proceedings was made by LAURENCE S. CREIDER in “The Development of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles”; it will be published on the paper version of the ICP: The paper was kindly sent to me by Barbara Tillett with an email dated April 29, 2009.

⁵Two years of hard work, that became even harder from 2003, came before the Frankfurt meeting. Cf. the report by Barbara B. Tillett at the IFLA Congress in Berlin. http://www.ddb.de/news/pdf/ime_icc_report_berlin.pdf. There one can also find the introductory papers, the *Paris Principles* and the results of the comparison between them and eighteen European cataloguing codes, the draft of the *Statement* with relative translations. <http://www.ddb.de/news/ifla_conf_index.htm>.

⁶ Cf. PINO BUIZZA, “Verso nuovi principi e nuovi codici”, in *Principi di catalogazione internazionali: una piattaforma europea? Considerazioni sull’IME ICC di Francoforte e Buenos Aires. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, Bibliocom, 51° Congresso AIB, 27 ottobre 2004*, edited by MAURO GUERRINI, Roma: Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2008, p. 30-45; especially p. 45.

⁷ The Seoul (2006) and Pretoria (2007) meetings were very important, where various issues came to the surface: linguistic ones (the use of non-Latin scripts) and conceptual ones linked to the form of names: relevant changes in the December 2003 *Statement* were made only after the end of 2007, resulting from a synthesis of the various proposals that had been presented.

⁸ On the local level the organizing members were: IME ICC 1, Frankfurt (2003): Renate Gömpel, Susanne Oehlschläger, Gunilla Jonsson, Natalia Kasparova, Monika Münnich, Marie-France Plassard, Susanne Oehlschläger, Claudia Fabian, Hans Popst, Ann Huthwaite and colleagues at Die Deutsch Bibliothek (now Deutsche National Bibliothek); IME ICC 2 Buenos Aires (2004): Estela Chahbenderian, Beth Davis-Brown, Ageo García B., Norma Mangiaterra, Ana Maria Martínez, Irene Münster,

Graciela Spedalieri, Carlos A. Zapata Cardenas, Fernanda Guedes de Campos; IME ICC 3 Cairo (2005): Ansam Baranekm, James Gentner, William J. Kopycki, Anyman el-Masry, Mahmoud Rashad, Mona Abdel Kader Sherief Ra'ouf, Khalid Mohammed Reyad, Wessam Samir, Sameh Shalaby, Arthur Smith, Alaa el-Talmas; IME ICC 4, Seoul (2006): Jaesun Lee and colleagues at the National Library of Korea; IME ICC 5, Pretoria (2007): Susan Battison, Elmaré Broodryk, Tienie de Klerk, Judith Kuhagen, Pat Riva, Hester van der Walt.

⁹ ICP, *Introduction*.

¹⁰ ICP, *Introduction*.

¹¹ INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CATALOGUING PRINCIPLES, *Statement of Principles*, Paris, 1961, available at <http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/paris_principles_1961.pdf>, p. 1.

¹² FRSAD has not yet been published.

¹³ BARBARA B. TILLET, "RDA (Resource Description and Access): lo sviluppo di un nuovo codice di catalogazione internazionale", op. cit.

¹⁴ Cf. <<http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/papers-muennich.pdf>>.

¹⁵ "Statement of international cataloguing principles", draft approved by the IFLA MEETING OF EXPERTS ON AN INTERNATIONAL CATALOGUING CODE, 1st, Frankfurt, Germany, 2003, available at <http://www.ddb.de/news/pdf/statement_draft.pdf>.

¹⁶ Cfr.

<http://www.imeicc5.com/download/Statement_draft_Nov_5_2007_with%20IME_ICC_5_recommendations_m.pdf>.

¹⁷ A group of Italian scholars (Mauro Guerrini, Carlo Bianchini, Pino Buizza, and Giuliano Genetasio, with a contribution by Alberto Petrucciani) cooperated in the development of the text. They sent several comments on the conceptual structure (like the suggestion to distinguish between principles and objectives), some observations on the general architecture as well as on single rules and on the terminology and glossary that were adopted.

¹⁸ "Based on bibliographic literature, especially by Ranganathan and Leibniz, as described in Elaine Svenonius, *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000, p. 68. With regard to subject thesauri, there are

additional principles that apply but are not yet included in this statement” (note of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*).

¹⁹ Cf. *Statement of principles adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961*, with commentary and examples by EVA VERONA, assisted by FRANZ GEORG KALTWASSER, P.R. LEWIS, ROGER PIERROT, London: IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971, p. 2-3.

²⁰ Cf. ÁKOS DOMANOVSKY, *Functions and objects of author and title cataloguing. A contribution to cataloguing theory*, English text edited by ANTHONY THOMSON, München: Verlag Dokumentation, 1975.

²¹ “Work, expression, manifestation, and item are the Group 1 entities described in the FRBR model” (note of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*).

²² “Person, family, and corporate body are the Group 2 entities described in the FRBR and FRAD models” (note of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*).

²³ “Concept, object, event, and place are the Group 3 entities described in the FRBR model. Any of the entities may be involved in a subject relationship with a work” (note of the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*).

²⁴ Cf. PATRICK LE BŒUF, *Brave New FRBR World* (Version 3), prepared for the 3rd IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (IME ICC 3), December 12-14, 2005, Cairo, Egypt, revised by Barbara Tillett, delivered in Cairo by Elena Escolano Rodríguez, <http://www.loc.gov/loc/ifla/imeicc/pdf/papers_leboeuf-eng.pdf>. About the development of FRBR cf. PATRICK LE BŒUF, *De FRBRer à FRBRoo. Lectio Magistralis in library science, Florence, Italy, Florence University, March 17, 2009* = *Da FRBRer a FRBRoo. Lectio Magistralis in biblioteconomia, Firenze, Università degli studi di Firenze, 17 marzo 2009*, translation by GRAZIANO RUFFINI, [Fiesole (FI)]: Casalini Libri, 2009.

²⁵ GRUPPO DI STUDIO SULLA CATALOGAZIONE DELL'AIB, *Osservazioni su Functional requirements for bibliographic records: final report*, “Bollettino AIB”, 39 (1999), n. 3, p. 303-311.

²⁶ Cf. FRBR, 3.2.3.

²⁷ Cf. CARLO BIANCHINI and MAURO GUERRINI, “From bibliographic models to cataloging rules: remarks on FRBR, ICP, ISBD, and RDA and the relationships between them”, *Cataloging & classification quarterly*, 47 (2009), issue 2, p. 105-124.

²⁸ Cf. MAURO GUERRINI, *Catalogazione*, Roma: Associazione italiane biblioteche, 1999.

²⁹ ICP, Glossary, ad nomen.

³⁰ We also find the term in Dublin Core, both as synonym and as broader concept for author, with the meaning of “the entity who has the main responsibility for the intellectual content of the work. It can be a person, a corporate body, an organization, a service.”

³¹ Cf. the ample treatment of the issue in PINO BUIZZA, MAURO GUERRINI, “Author and title access point control,” <http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/papers_buizza.pdf>.

³² Cf. the review by PINO BUIZZA of “IFLA cataloguing principles: steps towards an international cataloguing code, 2: report from the 2nd IFLA meeting of experts on an international cataloguing code, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2004”, edited by BARBARA B. TILLET and ANA LUPE CRISTAN. München: Saur, 2006; e di: “IFLA cataloguing principles: steps towards an international cataloguing code, 3: report from the 3rd IFLA meeting of experts on an international cataloguing code, Cairo, Egypt, 2005”, edited by BARBARA B. TILLET, KHALED MOHAMED REYAD, ANA LUPE CRISTAN. München: Saur, 2006, *Bollettino AIB*, 47 (2007), n. 1-2, p. 159.

³³ COMMISSIONE CATALOGAZIONE E INDICIZZAZIONE DELL’AIB, *Osservazioni sul documento della Commissione RICA "Forma dell'intestazione - Autore personale"*, <<http://www.aib.it/aib/commiss/catal/rica01.htm>>, November 13, 2004.

³⁴ *Persona* is a term the English language borrowed from Latin at the end of the twentieth century with a psychological meaning (in some dictionaries it is defined: “an aspect of personality showed by a person to others or perceived by others”) or in the theatre world (“a role or a character performed by an author or an actor”).

³⁵ LAURENCE S. CREIDER, *The Development of the Statement ...*, op. cit.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Cf. “On the record. Report of the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control,” available at <<http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/lcwg-ontherecord-jan08-final.pdf>>.

³⁸ Cf. MAURO GUERRINI, “Introduction,” in “Authority control in organizing and accessing information: Definition and international experience,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, Part I, vol. 38, nos. 3-4 (2004); Part II, vol. 39, nos. 1-2

(2004). Proceedings available at

<<http://www.digital.casalini.it/fulltext/is.asp?isbn=888453111X>>.

³⁹ “Form and structure of corporate headings”, recommendations of the WORKING GROUP on CORPORATE HEADINGS; approved by the STANDING COMMITTEES of the IFLA SECTION on CATALOGUING and the IFLA SECTION on OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS, London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1980.

⁴⁰ <archive.ifla.org/VII/s13/scatn/final2000.htm>.

⁴¹ “A Review of the Feasibility of an International Standard Authority Data Number (ISADN)”, prepared for the IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records by BARBARA B. TILLET, <<http://www.archive.ifla.org/VII/d4/franar-numbering-paper.pdf>>. Cf. also <<http://www.archive.ifla.org/VII/d4/franar-numbering-paper.pdf>>, based on BARBARA B. TILLET, “Numbers to identify Entries (ISADNs-International Standard Authority Data Numbers),” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 44, nos. 3-4 (2007): 343-361.

⁴² Cf. <<http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/viaf/>>.

⁴³ <<http://viaf.org/>>.

⁴⁴ Cf. “Mandatory data elements for internationally shared resource authority records” (1998), <<http://www.archive.ifla.org/VI/3/p1996-2/mlar.htm>>.

⁴⁵ Cf. PINO BUIZZA, “Controllo bibliografico e authority control dai Principi di Parigi a oggi”, in *Authority control: definizione ed esperienze internazionali. Atti del convegno, Firenze, 10-12 febbraio 2003*, a cura di MAURO GUERRINI and BARBARA B. TILLET, Firenze: Firenze University Press; Roma: Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2003.

⁴⁶ LAURENCE S. CREIDER, *The Development of the Statement ...*, op. cit.

⁴⁷ Comment of LAURENCE S. CREIDER, *The Development of the Statement ...*, op. cit.

⁴⁸ Cf. PINO BUIZZA, “Verso nuovi principi e nuovi codici”, in *Principi di catalogazione internazionali: una piattaforma europea? Considerazioni sull’IME ICC di Francoforte e Buenos Aires. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, Bibliocom, 51° Congresso AIB, 27 ottobre 2004*, edited by MAURO GUERRINI, Roma: Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2008, p. 30-45; especially p. 45.

⁴⁹ Cf. LOUISE F. SPITERI, *The Classification Research Group and The Theory of Integrative Levels*, available at

<<http://www.web.archive.org/web/20011222083409/alexia.lis.uiuc.edu/review/summer1995/spiteri.html>>.

⁵⁰ Tom Delsey, "Modeling Subject Access: Extending the FRBR and FRANAR Conceptual Models," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 39, nos. 3-4 (2004): 49-61. The topic had already been discussed by PINO BUIZZA and MAURO GUERRINI, "A Conceptual Model for the New Soggettario: Subject Indexing in the Light of FRBR," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 34, no. 4 (2002): 31-45.

⁵¹ Cf. The Quebec report, c 2008, <<http://www.archive.ifa.org/VII/s29/pubs/wgfrsar-committee-report-quebec2008.pdf>>

⁵² "Principles underlying subject heading languages (SHLs)", edited by MARIA INES LOPES and JULIANNE BEALL, München: Saur, 1999.

⁵³ Cf. Laurence S. Creider, "The Development of the Statement ...", op. cit. cf. also MAURO GUERRINI, "Towards an international cataloguing code. 10 questions to Barbara Tillett", *International cataloguing and bibliographic control*, 34 (2005), no. 1, p. 18-20.

⁵⁴ ICP, *Introduction*.

⁵⁵ Cf. CARLO BIANCHINI, *Riflessioni sull'universo bibliografico. Funzioni, oggetti e modelli della catalogazione per autore e titolo*, Foreword by MAURO GUERRINI, Milano: Sylvestre Bonnard, c 2005.

⁵⁶ C. LAURENCE S. CREIDER, "The Development of the Statement ...", op. cit.