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ABSTRACT. The method of integrating rules for nonbook materials with those for print materials in AACR2 is examined to see how well nonbook materials are handled and whether the treatment of print materials is affected. Both choice of entry rules and rules for description are examined to see whether their provisions are in accordance with the needs of users of these materials, and/or the patterns of publication and identification of these materials. Areas needing further research are identified.

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR took as two of its guidelines in 1974 “commitment to the principle of standardization in the bibliographic description of all types of materials” and “determination of the treatment of nonbook materials primarily from a consideration of the published cataloguing rules of the Canadian Library Association, the Library Association, and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology; and of the ALA revision of chapter 12 of the 1967 text.” The method employed in the published code for the treatment of nonbook materials is: 1) the provision of separate chapters of rules of description for different media, all designed to create descriptions with the same elements in the same order in accordance with the ISBD(G) structure, and 2) the provision of a set of general rules for “headings, uniform titles and references,” including rules for “choice of access points,” which “apply to all library materials.”

This paper proposes to examine this method of integrating the rules for nonbook materials with the rules for print materials with two basic questions in view: 1) How well are the conditions that arise among nonbook materials dealt with by a code which takes this approach? 2) How has this method of integration affected the code as a whole and its treatment of print materials? In the process, a number of suggestions will be made for further research to help us answer these questions.

Contrary to the order dictated by AACR2, questions of entry will be considered before questions of description, since in discussing the latter, it will be necessary to refer back to questions raised in the discussion of the former. In considering entry, the discussion will be limited to choice of entry. Nonbook materials raise many interesting questions about form
of name and form of uniform titles, but they must be left outside the scope of this paper to keep it within manageable limits.

Since AACR2 does not clearly state the basic principles from which its rules are derived, the extrapolation of principles from the rules as written will be attempted in the following discussion, following the example set by several previous writers (Richmond and Simonton). By principles are meant fundamental rules which are particularized by the specific rules in a code, and which can be referred to when the more specific rules fail to address a particular case.

AACR2 has rules to deal with the following types of materials:

1. books, pamphlets and printed sheets
2. cartographic materials
3. manuscripts
4. music
5. sound recordings
6. motion pictures and videorecordings
7. graphic materials
8. machine readable data files
9. 3-dimensional artefacts and realia
10. microforms
11. serials

This paper will consider mainly the non-textual materials, or the materials not created using the written word predominantly, that is, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9, although microforms in their capacity as reproductions will be discussed briefly. A person with expert knowledge of all these materials would be rare indeed, and the writer cannot claim to be such a person. I have had more experience with some than with others. I will attempt to raise issues pertinent to all or many of these materials in the hopes that those with more expertise than I in any particular area will be inspired to enlighten us all with more detailed discussions of these issues as they apply to their particular materials.

In the general introduction to AACR2, it is stated that the rules “are not specifically intended for specialist and archival libraries, but it is recommended that such libraries use the rules as the basis of their cataloguing and augment their provisions as necessary.” The recommendation is, in effect, that such libraries use AACR2 rules for description and access, and make more notes and added entries if necessary, or specify in a more detailed way what should be put in various areas of the description. This paper will be examining the elements and order of the elements called for in the description by AACR2, and the rules for choice of entry. Although choice of a main entry is now optional, adoption of the complete code as written would require a specialist or archi-
it can be seen by looking at reference tools devoted exclusively to var­ious kinds of nonbook materials that there are other traditions of entry. For example, I know of no film reference tools (other than catalogs based on AACR revised Chapter 12) which provide primary access un­der anything other than title.

I hope it is clear that in the foregoing I am raising questions about the value of the principle of authorship in the entry of nonbook materials, but not about the value of displaying the work unit to the user, which I take to be the function of the main entry heading in the Anglo-American cataloging tradition; nor am I questioning the value of gathering together the works of authors who work in nonprint media.

While we are considering the principle of authorship as applied to nonbook materials, it is worth examining the kinds of authorship often found in these materials, and how these conditions have been analyzed and handled by AACR2.

The non-textual materials covered in this paper (see above) have strong visual and aural components which are frequently non-verbal. Their creation usually involves carrying out multiple functions, and these functions may be carried out by different people and corporate bodies. Thus, the making of a map may involve the gathering of data by one person or group of persons and the encapsulation of the data in map form by another or others; one person or group may be responsible for the geographic aspect of a map, and another for the subject aspect. The making of a slide set may involve the taking of photographs, the compi­ling of appropriate pictures, the writing of an accompanying text, the writing or performing of accompanying music, etc. Visual materials can involve the maker of a picture, and the subject of a picture, which may itself be the intellectual or artistic work of another or others. Films, for example, are the products of the art of photography, and can be used to display all the other arts, including dance, music, sculpture, etc., or they can display a person presenting his or her intellectual work by another or others. Films, for example, an animated abstract film with the animation by one person and the accompanying music performed and composed by another (specifically for the film) is clearly a work of mixed responsibility, but there is no rule to deal with it.

Although it is not so stated in the statement of scope of works of authorship in the cataloging tradition, nor am I questioning the value of gathering together any of the principles of authorship, it is no easy matter to integrate rules to deal with these complex forms of authorship into a code which has been expanded sufficiently to deal with all the conditions of mixed authorship which can arise now. For that nonbook materials are to be entered according to these rules. For example, an animated abstract film with the animation by one person and the accompanying music performed and composed by another (specifically for the film) is clearly a work of mixed responsibility, but there is no rule to deal with it.

When one considers the number of functions that are performed in creating nonbook materials, it can be seen that it is no easy matter to inte­grate rules to deal with these complex forms of authorship into a code which has been expanded sufficiently to deal with all the conditions of mixed authorship which can arise now. For that nonbook materials are to be entered according to these rules. For example, an animated abstract film with the animation by one person and the accompanying music performed and composed by another (specifically for the film) is clearly a work of mixed responsibility, but there is no rule to deal with it.
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When one considers the number of functions that are performed in creating nonbook materials, it can be seen that it is no easy matter to inte­grate rules to deal with these complex forms of authorship into a code which has been expanded sufficiently to deal with all the conditions of mixed authorship which can arise now. For that nonbook materials are to be entered according to these rules. For example, an animated abstract film with the animation by one person and the accompanying music performed and composed by another (specifically for the film) is clearly a work of mixed responsibility, but there is no rule to deal with it.
of works by different persons (21.23C). Thus, the work units under a performer-author’s name will be complete only if he is an author in the first sense, that is, when he performs and improvises. Apparently improvisation here is considered to be a substantial enough change to the nature and content of the original work that it becomes a new work. One might ask, though, is not the true authorship function here improvisation rather than performance? Performance is essentially a condition of mixed authorship—the performer performs something created by someone else; if he created it himself, he is an author by virtue of that alone. AACR2 does not provide us with an example of a film or videorecording which has a performer as its author. Presumably performance would have to go beyond mere performance here as well, but how far beyond? If a performer in a film ad libs his lines, would he qualify for main entry? What of the photograph(s) who created the film footage? Or is this a way of dealing with cases in which a film or videorecording serves mainly as a recording medium and the intellectual or artistic content of the work is the responsibility of the person displaying intellectual or artistic work before the camera? (An example would be a videorecording of a lecturer in which the videorecording apparatus has been set up on a table and left to run throughout the lecture, with no camera movement or editing to introduce other intellectual or artistic functions into the creation of the work.)

All of these questions arise because the condition of mixed authorship inherent in audiovisual materials has not yet been adequately analyzed in AACR2 to provide rules to deal with the variety of permutations of various authorship functions to be found in these materials. Whether it is even possible to do this is another question, but if we are determined to base choice of entry of nonbook materials on conditions of authorship, we must face up to the problem.

It can be seen that the manner in which nonbook materials are treated in AACR2 necessitates a careful re-examination of our definition of authorship as well. What kinds of functions can, if carried out, create a work, and what kinds of functions are necessarily subsidiary ones? Is it not the case that the same function can be primary in one work and subsidiary in another? Is there any way to devise criteria to allow catalogers to make such judgments? Is it worth doing the work necessary to analyze these conditions of authorship for materials for which primary entry based on authorship may not correspond to the way users approach these works? Is it possible to analyze these conditions to produce author entries which are consistent and predictable, so that users can learn to look where we have put the primary entry or work unit? Is there any hope for assembling complete work units for all the works of an author under that author’s name, if the author works in a nonbook medium where mixed authorship is so prevalent?

B. The Work

Although the application of the principle of choice of a main entry heading in order to display the work unit to the user is now optional in AACR2, when the option is exercised by the use of Chapter 21 rules for the choice of entry, another unspoken principle can be deduced from the rules in AACR2, that is, that the work transcends medium. Another way of saying this would be that a film or a map, for example, can be an edition of a work which originally manifested itself in another physical medium. Has this principle ever been carefully examined? Certainly in entering a sounding recording of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony under Beethoven and the uniform title for the Fifth Symphony, we are asserting that the sounding recording is an edition of Beethoven’s original score, and this is a fairly traditional way of treating such a recording. Is the score, and this is a fairly traditional way of treating such a recording. Is the work a film of the New York Philharmonic playing Beethoven’s Fifth also an edition of the New York Philharmonic’s score? Is a film of a performance of Shakespeare’s Hamlet an edition of Shakespeare’s score? What does this mean? Are we asserting that the works of an author should be identified and cited using his or her name, and displayed together under that author’s name as if it were a primary entry, even if the work was a film of a performance or a sound recording of a composition? Is it worth doing the work necessary to answer such questions as whether photographs are authors of the works they create? AACR2 says that “photographers are the authors of the works they create.”
his or her name, no matter what the medium of the works. However, if
the rules for entry of monographs do not work to collocate the works of
an author in another medium, this would provide another argument for
separate rules. For example, a film of Hans Selye speaking on stress
would most likely be entered under title according to AACR2, while his
monographic works are entered under him. In this case, it could be ar­
gued that an integrated code works against an integrated catalog. (I am
indebted to Elizabeth Baughman for helping me to identify the argu­
ments in this paragraph.)

AACR2 asserts, in 21.23C, that a collection of musical works by dif­
ferent composers is the work of the performer, yet a collection of works by
the same composer is the work of the composer. What kind of a defi­
nition of work would cover the concept of work underlying these rules?

With maps, we have the problem of a previously published map be­
ing republished as a base map with a new thematic overlay. Is this an
adaptation?

In AACR2, a reproduction of an art work is treated sometimes as a
new work, e.g., a lithograph of a painting, and sometimes as an edition
of the original, e.g., a photograph of a painting. I have dealt with the
problem of photography as authorship above, but obviously the issue
also has to do with the question what is a work and what is an edition of
a work.

In works of mixed authorship, since different functions can be per­
formed by different people, it is sometimes possible for the work of one
person to be extracted from the work as a whole and published sepa­
rately. This is very common with films. For example, the screenplay of
a film may be published as a monograph, or the sound track of a film
may be published as a sound recording. Thus, the sound track of Man­
hattan, all music by George Gershwin, becomes in AACR2 a work by
Gershwin entitled Manhattan. In a way, this is not a new problem. For
example, we have a specific rule, 21.11B, for illustrations published sepa­
rately from the work illustrated, and, in truth, it is questionable
whether a separate rule is needed, since rule 21.4A, the general rule for
works of single personal authorship, would give the same kind of under­
lying this approach is the principle that when a conflict arises between
the work principle and the authorship principle, the latter is predom­
nant. Another way of putting this is that when a part of a work of mixed
authorship, consisting of the work of the performer of one of the mixed
functions is published separately, it becomes a new work.

C. Title Page Representation

The rules for entry of monographs of multiple and mixed authorship
have relied heavily in the past on the criteria of title page representation,
e.g., whether on the title page one author’s name is the first of two or
three, or whether one author is represented as principal author. AACR2,
in applying these same rules to nonbook materials without changing the
criteria for entry, is revealing another unspoken principle—that title
page representation has the same power in the field of nonbook materi­
als as it does for monographs.

The argument for using title page representation in the case of mono­
graphs is that, as Lubetzky says, “The most important characteristic of
the book, for the purposes of cataloging, is that fact that it is provided
with a prominent identification tag in the form of a title page. The
cataloger can thus anticipate how a particular book will normally be
cited and looked for and provide for it accordingly.” Thus, if a mono­
cat title page reads “by X,” it is likely it will be cited under X’s
name. The title frames on a film, slide set or videotape may sometimes
read “by X,” or, for example, “a film by X.” However, this is haphaz­
ard; one film directed by Antonioni may read “a film by Michelangelo
Antonioni;” another, just as indubitably an Antonioni film, will not.

The title frames of Public Enemy read “by Kubic Glasman and John
Wright [the screenwriters]; directed by William Wellman.”

As Ronald Hagler points out, many nonbook materials have no title
pages. Responsibility may be variously attributed on the work itself,
on its container, or in accompanying material, or there may be no attri­
bution at all, as with many graphic materials. Maps are notorious for
bearing the names of corporate bodies without indicating the nature of
their responsibility, and with maps the whole map is the title page. At­
their responsibility, and with maps the whole map is the title page. At­
took the form of attributing the major functions to one person, e.g.,
“Directed, produced, written and photographed by...” but accepting this
as an attribution of principal responsibility requires judgment as to what
the major functions are, and leads to problems with many borderline
cases.

But besides all these problems, the fundamental question is whether
the principle of title page representation works for nonbook materials
the way it is felt to work for monographs. Does it influence citation?
This brings us back to the need for research on the strength of the prin­
ciple of authorship in the field of nonbook. Do users cite and seek these
materials under author primarily, and, as a corollary, will they be more
inclined to cite under an author to whom primary responsibility is
attributed?

II. IMPACT ON THE CODE AND ITS TREATMENT OF PRINT
MATERIALS: CHOICE OF ENTRY

Let us review the ways in which the rules for choice of entry have
changed in AACR2 in response to the inclusion of nonbook materials in
the corpus of works to be entered according to these rules, and examine
some of the ways these changes affect the structure and logic of the
code as a whole. We have discussed above the inclusion of performance
as a kind of authorship, and the way in which the inclusion of a function
which is inherently a function of mixed authorship introduces a degree
of inconsistency and lack of clarity in the definition of authorship in
AACR2. The fact that this kind of authorship is limited to sound recordings,
films and videorecorderings in the definition is in conflict with the
general statement a few pages earlier that "the rules in Part II apply to
all library materials irrespective of the medium in which they are pub­
lished." In fact, the same point can be made about the inclusion of
sound recordings, films and videorecorderings (and recently, by revision,
maps) as types in 21.1B2, and the inclusion of rules entitled "Art
works," "Musical works," and "Sound recordings" in the rules for
mixed responsibility. Isn't this a rather significant intrusion of rules for
types of publications in a code which purports to be the second edition
of the first code to base entry (of monographs only, of course) on the
analysis of conditions of authorship rather than types of publication? If
it is argued that sound recordings as a group exhibit unique conditions
of authorship, why not rules for maps, films, etc., as exhibiting unique
conditions of authorship?

The problems in applying the rules for multiple authorship to non­
book materials have been discussed above, but the fact that many works
of mixed responsibility must be entered according to rules for shared re-
ponsibility is another example of impaired logic in the code due to the
indigestibility of these materials. The division of the rules for mixed re­
sponsibility into rules for "works that are modifications of other works"
and rules for "mixed responsibility in new works" indicates some work
was done in this area to try to create more general rules to try to accom­
modate nonbook materials in a logical fashion, and art works, music
and sound recordings are indeed included here. (This supposition on my
part was verified recently by Michael Gorman in conversation.) How­
ever, only one general rule was written (21.9). There is no general rule
for mixed responsibility in new works. It is interesting that rule 21.9
shows a shift in emphasis from the relative importance of different au­
thorship functions in AACR1, to the degree of modification of a work.
Could this be because of a reluctance to deal with the many functions of
authorship carried out in the creation of nonbook materials, and the
complexities and varieties of their combinations? What is the impact of
this shift in emphasis on the entry of print materials?

One of the major changes in AACR2 is the fact that the choice of a
main entry is now optional. This revolutionary change, if carried out,
would have a monumental effect on both the organization of records for
print materials in our catalogs, and on the organization of the materials
themselves on the shelves, and it is very likely that this change can be
laid on the doorstep of nonbook materials. One of the source codes for
nonbook materials cited in the Preface of AACR2 is the LANCET code
developed in Great Britain, which called for title unit entry. This is, in
effect, an option now in AACR2, in that it is now possible to elect not
to choose main entries and still claim to be following an international
standard. Title unit entry as a solution to the problems of mixed author­
ship would appear to be rather a case of throwing the baby out with the
bath water, since it does not allow the choice of a standard citation for a
work, necessary in present day systems to create work units. I have seen
no evidence to prove that work units are not as functional for organizing
records for works of mixed authorship as for the records for any other
works. At any rate, this paper raises questions only about the utility of
the principle of authorship as a basis for creating work units for some
nonbook materials. It would be ironic if the attempt to apply to nonbook
materials principles originally designed for the organization of mono­
graph records were eventually to provide ammunition for those who ad­
vocate title unit entry for all materials, including monographs of single
personal authorship, an approach which would atomize the catalog orga­
nization so carefully designed by monograph catalogers over the

III. TREATMENT OF NONBOOK MATERIALS BY AACR2:
DESCRIPTION

The approach to description in AACR2 is to provide separate chap­
ters of rules for the description of different "classes" or "types" of materi­
als, in addition to a general chapter of rules which apply to all materi­
als in the absence of specific rules in the particular chapters. The
application of any chapter(s) will produce a description with the same
elements of description in the same order. The only exception to this is
the provision of an extra area for maps and serials.

The unspoken principle here is that (with the exception of maps and
serials), the description of different kinds of materials does not require
more or fewer elements of the description, or a different ordering of
these elements than the description for books. In other words, the only
necessary variation is in the rules for what to put in each of these areas.
This principle will be examined further below.

A second principle has been made explicit, as follows: "It is a cardi­
nal principle of the use of Part I that the description of a physical item
should be based in the first instance on the chapter dealing with the class
of materials to which that item belongs." AACR2's cardinal principle
addresses a problem introduced into cataloging with the advent of new
methods of exact reproduction by means of photography or sound reproduction with magnetic tape. Before the advent of these methods, a work was reissued by means of resetting type, a procedure which was likely to introduce variation in the text, or which provided an opportunity for revision of the text. Therefore, it was important to be able to identify and describe various editions because of the possibility for change in content. These new methods create exact copies of the original. Textual content remains the same, although visual and aural components may exhibit slight variation in terms of quality of reproduction. When reproduction involves change in the physical medium, as in the case of a microform of a book, a videorecording of a motion picture, an audiorecording of a sound recording, etc., the cataloging problem is not that of indicating change in content, but of indicating that different equipment must be used to gain access to the content, and that the content may be acquired from different sources. This forces us to set priorities in terms of the objectives of descriptive cataloging. Is the primary objective to differentiate between editions which are likely to exhibit change in content? Or will we allow a manifestation which are copies of the same content? Or will we allow a change in the physical medium, as in the case of a microform of a book, a videorecording of a motion picture, an audiorecording of a sound recording, etc.? The question then arises whether the content remains the same, although visual and aural components may exhibit change?
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Another related question raised by AACR2’s cardinal principle is that of the nature of the classification principle which lies behind this division into “classes of materials.” Are serials a class of materials in the same sense that maps are? Is a map any less a map because it is issued as a slide? Are we not perhaps dealing here with types of materials, and certain conditions which can obtain with any type of material? AACR2 itself seems to recognize this to a degree when, elsewhere in the code, Chapters 2–10 are characterized as rules for “specific types of materials,” while Chapters 11–13 (microforms, serials, analysis) are termed “rules of partial generality.” It is perhaps unfortunate that the code-makers did not follow along this line of reasoning a bit further. Is it possible that better results could be obtained if general rules were devised for the modification of various elements of the description of an item in any physical medium which was issued serially, required analysis, or was a reproduction?

Another unspoken principle in AACR2 is that title page transcription is as useful a principle of description for nonbook materials as for monographs. The assumption behind this principle for monographs is that different monograph editions will exhibit differences somewhere on the title page, from the title through the imprint, and that copies of the
people would consider to be the title proper. Since most films and videorecordings will probably still be entered under title in AACR2, the ISBD rule, when followed literally, would produce main entries which would probably never be consulted. The Library of Congress has found it necessary to issue a rule interpretation to prevent the occurrence of the most blatant cases, but one of their examples in which the rule should continue to be applied, Neil Simon’s *Seems like old times*, still is a most unsatisfactory main entry.

The rationale behind the ISBD rule has never been made explicit, but surely the desire was to create a rule which could be applied mechanically and uniformly. If it is necessary to produce interpretations to save the rule from producing ridiculous results, perhaps the time has come to reconsider the rule itself, since with the interpretation, mechanical uniformity is no longer possible. To my knowledge, no one has yet done any research to determine the average amount of time it takes a cataloger to recognize the title of a work under the old rules versus the ISBD rule, the relative degree of uniformity produced by these rules, or the correspondence between ISBD-produced titles and titles cited and sought by users.

The statement of responsibility area has proven to be a problematic one for many nonbook materials. AACR2, in several cases, has taken the approach of listing functions, the performers of which should be listed in this area. However, the functions listed do not correspond in all cases to the kinds of authorship functions now recognized as qualifying for main entry. Thus films, videorecordings or sound recordings can be entered under performers who do not qualify for inclusion in statements of responsibility.

Many of the nonbook materials, as discussed earlier in this paper, are products of mixed responsibility in which many functions are performed. When monographs are described, statements of subsidiary authorship can serve to identify editions, and are thus transcribed even when not traced. With nonbook materials created by the performance of multiple functions, it is apparently not considered feasible to list even the names of all those who have carried out primary functions in some cases. Therefore, a different kind of judgment is required. Perhaps a better approach than listing functions would be to provide some state­

The provision of a publication/distribution area for nonbook materials creates many problems, perhaps stemming from the fact that many of these materials do not carry statements instantly recognizable as im­
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description or adequate definitions. Nonbook materials tend to be cataloged not by transcribing statements of responsibility and imprints from title pages, but by pulling out names from a number of areas in the item and its accompanying material and placing them into areas of the description. Thus, clear principles and definitions would be particularly helpful in helping catalogers to decide which names belong where, and in ensuring that such a description carries out its proper function.

IV. IMPACT ON THE CODE AND ITS TREATMENT OF PRINT MATERIALS: DESCRIPTION

In AACR2, we are directed to prepare a description of a physical item without reference to its nature as a particular manifestation of a particular work. Then, to this description, we are to add a main entry and added entries (or access points, as the case might be), based on its nature as a work.19 We are not directed to complete area 7 of the description after we have determined entries, although if we don't, we can on occasion be left with entries, the reason for which is not apparent from the description. At any rate, the revelation in the description of relationships between the item and other editions of a work and other works becomes merely fortuitous unless the cataloger goes beyond what is called for by AACR2. This approach to description is the corollary to allowing title unit entry as an option in AACR2, and as such can be said to stem, at least partially, from the inclusion of nonbook rules, as stated earlier in the paper. As far as description goes, this is a subtle change, but it might be worth doing some research to discover how often the description of the physical item is in fact inadequate for revealing relationships and justifying access points, requiring contravention of the strictest application of AACR2. Is it wise to abandon the principle of identifying and distinguishing works and editions of works for that of describing a physical item, revealing no relationship to any other item other than that revealed fortuitously in the course of the description? Has the integration of rules for nonbook materials perhaps contributed to our unwillingness to look past the physical nature of these bulky, hard to store items, to their relationship to the other works and editions of works in our collections?

With the advent of ISBD description of monographs, the rules for choosing a "chief source of information" for various elements of the description have broadened considerably. This occurred before the development of ISBD's for nonbook materials, so cannot be entirely attributed to the advent of nonbook. However, as noted above, nonbook materials do not have title pages in the same way monographs do, and the approach to transcription with these materials has tended to allow the picking and choosing of information to place in the description with much less regard to indicating in the description where it was found (i.e., less use of bracketing). Thus it could be argued that the integration of nonbook rules into the code at least encourages the continuation of this approach to monographs. To my knowledge, the expansion of the chief source of information for monographs was carried out without doing any research on the impact of such a change on the identification and distinguishing of monograph editions, and it might be well to do such research, if only to assess the results of our actions.

V. SUMMARY

In this paper we have been examining a particular approach to the integration of nonbook materials into our catalogs, that of AACR2. Michael Gorman describes this method as "a general application of truly general principles to all materials."20 It is important to remember that this is not the only approach possible. There is no reason records drawn up according to different principles based on different conditions found among nonbook materials can't be interfiled among records for monographs. In fact, when we had separate rules for nonbook materials, records were interfiled. There is especially no reason why varying descriptive formats cannot be interfiled. Indeed, the format itself, if truly designed to identify and describe editions and works in the particular medium cataloged, could in itself serve as a kind of GMD, as the serials medium cataloged, could in itself serve as a kind of GMD, as the serials format used to be instantly recognizable before the advent of AACR2.

The main advantage to the AACR2 approach, if it could be carried out successfully, would be simplicity. One would have to learn only a few basic principles in order to find and be able to read descriptions of works and editions of works in all media. The creation of these records would also be simplified. A further economic benefit would be that the cost of computer programming and inputting costs could be kept down by the use of the same format and tagging conventions for all materials.

All of these advantages, however, depend on the discovery of those elusive "truly general principles" mentioned by Gorman. This paper has tried to demonstrate areas in which we still have work ahead of us to discover them. When making cataloging rules, it is important to remember that the ultimate purpose of the rules is to create a catalog organization which will serve as an intermediary between users with certain conventions as to where the things they seek will be found, and objects which exhibit certain patterns of identification on their title-page equivalents. If research were to discover that users of particular kinds of nonbook materials tend to seek them differently, and that particular kinds of materials do not identify themselves in the same ways,
this would call into question whether it is possible to discover "truly general principles."

Surely now is the time to carry out such research before we go further in the attempt to unravel the various complex conditions of authorship and publication patterns found among nonbook materials. Such a research program could be a healthy process, helping us to rediscover why we do what we do, and how our rules are related to the needs of our users and the behavior of the materials we catalog. In the process, we may find ourselves better able to clarify and formulate the basic principles behind our rules, and we may discover ways of doing what we are trying to do better than ever before. Then perhaps, instead of cursing at nonbook materials and putting them back on the to-be-cataloged-later shelf, we will bless them for providing the impetus for a cataloging renaissance.
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ABSTRACT. The principle of uniform headings in descriptive cataloging in the American and the evolution of the principle are discussed in terms of the history of cataloging in recent codes and considerably contrary to what is in the present cataloging system. In the process, we may find ourselves better able to clarify and formulate the basic principles behind our rules, and we may discover ways of doing what we are trying to do better than ever before. Then perhaps, instead of cursing at nonbook materials and putting them back on the to-be-cataloged-later shelf, we will bless them for providing the impetus for a cataloging renaissance.

INTRODUCTION

In the course of deliberations on, and plankoning the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2) in recent years, a central issue has been the principle of uniform heading in AACR2 which relate to headings established according to the new code are considerably contrary to what is in the present cataloging system. In the process, we may find ourselves better able to clarify and formulate the basic principles behind our rules, and we may discover ways of doing what we are trying to do better than ever before. Then perhaps, instead of cursing at nonbook materials and putting them back on the to-be-cataloged-later shelf, we will bless them for providing the impetus for a cataloging renaissance.
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