“The plurality of languages [...] is coextensive to an aptitude inherent in human nature, the aptitude for speech, in other words, languages are not a propriety of the human species. Only the aptitude for speech belongs to species. [...] What is specific is the human capacity itself to communicate by means of verbal signs; we find the same capacity scattered all over the world - as proved by the myth of the Tower of Babel. [...] The plurality of languages, one of the themes in von Humboldt's thought, somehow goes together with the universality of speech. The relation between speech and languages is utterly unique. My present remark leads us further than speech. The plurality of human beings, to put it in Annah Harendt's words, is a relevant manifestation of the cultural status of humankind. Such a plurality is not only linguistic but, precisely, cultural. Humankind, like speech, exists only in the plural. [...] The universalism for which we fight can only be coextensive with a more or less well controlled plurality”.

Paul Ricoeur


Outline of issues

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. Once the heading is chosen – personal author, corporate body, or title – the problem arises of adopting a uniform heading, i.e. to establish the one and only form of the name or title, so that all manifestations of an author's works appear at one point in the catalogue (second function, 2.2(a) of the Paris Principles).

Three main issues ensue:

1. The first one relates to which name or which title is to be adopted, i.e., real name, pseudonym, traditional name, attributed name, assumed name, acronym, or full name (e.g., CGIL or Confederazione generale italiana del lavoro), original title or translated title.
2. The second one relates to which form of the name or which form of the title is to be adopted, deciding in favour of a shorter or fuller form (e.g., Nicolò Ugo Foscolo or Ugo Foscolo), of one among the graphic and linguistic variants, including the ones dependent upon transliteration systems.
3. The third one, for personal authors only, whose name is made up of two or more terms, regards the entry word, the access element to put first, opting for direct form or some type of inversion or rotation of terms.

The general criteria, section 7 of the Paris Principles, recommends the name (or form of the name) or the title most frequently used in the original editions of the works, or, if not possible, in accepted authorities. At section 12 the choice of entry word is determined by agreed usage in the author's country, or, if not possible, in the language he generally uses.

Form of name and catalogue languages

Let's analyze in detail sections 7 and 8 to understand rightly the proposed form of name, particularly for personal authors.

The Paris Principles at section 7, state that “the uniform heading should normally be the most frequently used name (or form of name) or title appearing in editions of the works catalogued or in references to them by accepted authorities”, meaning that resorting to references takes place when the criteria of editions cannot be applied. 7.1 specifies that “when editions have appeared in several languages [i.e., in the original language and in translations].” preference should in general be given to a heading based on editions in the original

---

1 Paper presented at the Workshop Cataloguing and Authority Control, Rome, 21st–22nd November 2002, sponsored by ICCU, Istituto centrale per il catalogo unico e le informazioni bibliografiche. The authors wishes to thank Barbara Tillet, who has discussed with them about many questions; Barbara has also reviewed the English translation.
2 This clarification is in 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.
language [we add: when the criteria of editions is not applied, the original language criteria applies to references as well]; but if this language is not normally used in the catalogue, the heading may be derived from editions and references in one of the languages normally used there”. Section 7.1 introduces the principle of the original form, the one historically, geographically and linguistically closest to the author. A thorny problem ensues when the heading has to be written in a language alien to the culture of the library, typically, a language in a different script (for Italians, in non-Latin alphabets or in non-alphabetic scripts). We have here an obvious dichotomy between the language of the original editions (the basic criterion) and the language used in other editions, between the forms in the reference works of the original country and the ones in the reference works used in the cultural environment of the library. In other words 7.1 states a general rule and admits, as an exception, the possibility for the library to replace the form appearing in editions of the work in the original language, when it is not normally used in the catalogue, with a form translated into a language accepted in its cultural environment. At 8.2 we read “The uniform heading [of a personal author] should be the name by which the author is most frequently identified in editions of his works – subject to section 7.1, that is, in the original language and only as an exception in translations if the original language is not normally used in the catalogue – in the fullest form commonly appearing there”.

In short, the name most frequently used in editions in the original language in the catalogued works is chosen. The solution implies collating the editions in the original language, of course not directly but by means of accepted authorities – to identify and adopt the most frequently used form, with the possibility of adopting a form based on translations only when the original language is alien to the catalogue. When the Paris Principles speak about editions of the catalogued works, the reference is to the works owned by the cataloguing library at section 7 that deals with uniform headings and at 8.1 that deals with main entry, whereas at 8.2 the reference is to the editions of all the works, even not owned by the library, but belonging to the corpus of the author's works. In short, the ideal reference – not always applicable – is the name most frequently used in the editions in the original language of the works.

Resorting to a form in a language normally used in the catalogue, when the original language of the work being catalogued is not used, is a criteria that implies a basic issue: the languages of the catalogue. The transcription of the title page and the standard bibliographic description (general material designation and physical description and note areas excluded) respect the language and script of the document (e.g., a title in Hebrew is registered in Hebrew, though transliteration of titles in non-Roman alphabets is normally allowed). Headings too have traditionally been registered according to the language of the document, until the Paris Principles themselves fixed the uniform heading, freed from the various forms present in different editions and based on the author's original language, as we have seen. Thus the catalogue is multilingual also in its headings; but in these an agency is allowed to give preference to a language used, that of the cataloguing agency itself, or, if not possible, another of the languages used in the catalogue. The languages not normally used in the catalogue – not better specified – are the ones that potentially require transposition to another script, for example transliteration or transcription into an alphabetic script, or that would be indecipherable by the majority of the library patrons; that is, in the end, not all the languages different from the ones spoken by the community served by the library (in Italy Italian is spoken, and French, German, English, Latin ... are not languages not normally used in the catalogue, whereas Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, Chinese, Japanese … are languages not normally used in the catalogue).

The language of the heading continued to be a problem also after the Paris Principles were issued. AACR (the Spanish rules too) adopted the English (and Spanish) form of the names normally presented in translations by English (Spanish) reference sources. The issue was put on the agenda at the 1969 International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts in Copenhagen, because headings based on translations would seriously impede the international exchange of bibliographic information and render the use of foreign catalogues and bibliographies much more difficult. In order to promote international uniformity, the IMCE strongly recommended the use, whenever possible, of the original form of names and titles rather than the forms used in the language of the country of the library with the direction to use standard transliteration systems, uniform systems of phonetic transcription and the exceptional admittance of Latin for Greek classics. Let's go back to the Paris Principles. Section 8.21 lists exceptions: “Another name or form of name should be taken as the uniform heading if it has become established in general usage either in references to the

author in biographical, historical and literary works, or in relation to his public activities other than authorship.” These exceptions are not of a linguistic nature but due to cultural usage (Eva Verona refers to works with no recent editions, works for which a significant change is possible in the name in ancient editions, and the current name5), or to particular situations, not related to authorship (e.g., a new office or a religious conversion) that brought about another name or form of name, thus imposing its unquestioned usage and preferring it to the one by which the author is most frequently identified in editions of his works. The choice of the form, therefore, depends on criteria presented in nonlinear way and potentially antithetical to each other:

a. the criterion of editions and that of reference sources;
b. the criterion of the original language, mitigated by the criterion of exclusion of the language alien to the catalogue, in relation both to editions and reference sources;
c. the criterion of full personal name;
d. the criterion of succession for names that have become accepted in general usage later or independently from authorship.

We tried to find a solution following the logic proposed by the ICCP, entrusting the national linguistic realities with competence on their own authors. If this attempt is right, perhaps, we can attain from it better clarity but it is still hard to locate reference works from which to infer the standard form and, eventually, different forms to be chosen: they are, first, the ones that state the use of the author's language, with the optional exclusion only of languages alien to the catalogue and, second, the ones that state the use of the language of the library. The need for authoritative lists stating the usages of the languages and of the countries, has been repeatedly pointed out, and their lack lamented and only partially amended (suffice glancing through Names of persons6 to realize how few are the cited reference works, some of them of dubious authority); all this seriously undermines the feasibility of coherently following the Paris Principles criteria.

**Entry word**

At section 12 the Paris Principles answer the third issue cited at the beginning of this paper, the one about the entry word: “When the name of a personal author consists of several words, the choice of entry word is determined as far as possible by agreed usage in the country of which the author is a citizen, or, if this is not possible, by agreed usage in the language which he generally uses”. It is a statement of principle that, dealing out the choice according to national or linguistic usage cannot have common rules to be fixed for all authors. The only general criterion is the preference for the most important and relevant element to name the author and search for him, but what this element is varies according to linguistic and social usage in each country. Keeping the position of prefixes or inverting them, is part of the issue. Thus the ICCP confirms preference for access forms closest the authors’ origins and the need for national agencies to make clear and unambiguous the criteria of their country and their language, so that they can be shared.

**Univocal headings**

To complete this overview of problems we remember the need for unique headings. A heading should not represent different authors as the Paris Principles state at 8.22 “a further identifying characteristic should be added, if necessary, to distinguish the author from others of the same name”. Homonyms, it is stated, must be made univocal by adding distinctive qualifiers, but the method to do so is not specified. At the IMCE it was only agreed not to use unused or little used forenames, without taking sides about the two most widespread systems in cataloguing codes: using dates of birth and death or qualifying by profession. No hint about the language of the qualifiers in the Paris Principles, yet the codes that prescribe to stating the profession agree on the use of the language of the library.7

**Form of name for corporate bodies**

---

5 Statement of principles, cit., p. 37
7 Statement of principles, cit., p. 38.
The Paris Principles at 9.4 give criteria for uniform headings under the name of corporate bodies similar to the ones for personal names: “The uniform heading for works entered under the name of a corporate body should be the name by which the body is most frequently identified in its publications”; conforming to 7.1, this means publications in the original language as specified by the IMCE.8 The exceptions are:

9.41, the official form of the name if variant forms of the name are frequently found (“and no form predominates”, the IMCE specifies9); if there are official names in several languages the choice is the language best adapted to the users of the catalogue (9.42);

9.43, a conventional name by which the corporate body is generally known; for international uniformity the IMCE recommends avoiding as far as possible the use of conventional names of international corporate bodies (e.g., for central bodies of the Catholic Church and for religious orders, for which the Latin form is to be preferred10);

9.44, the geographical name of the territory in the language best adapted to the users of the catalogue, but for international uniformity the IMCE recommends the use of original forms.11

Bodies subordinate to another body have a normal treatment, under their name (9.6), with two exceptions, stated at 9.61 that require the heading under the name of the superior body followed by the name of the subordinate body:

a. if the name itself of the subordinate body implies subordination or subordinate function (e.g., Società chimica italiana. Divisione di didattica)

b. if it is insufficient to identify it (e.g., Banca d'Italia. Servizio studi).

Administrative, judicial, and legislative organs, too, have headings subordinate to the territorial authority instead of directly under their name. The criteria for uniform heading of corporate bodies are homogeneous to the ones for personal authors, yet we can detect a greater tendency towards the use of forms in the language of the library rather than original names, a trend reduced by the corrections recommended by the IMCE.

The treatment of personal authors by national bibliographic agencies

After the analysis of the preliminary statements offered at the ICCP, with references to the specifications offered by the IMCE in 1969, let’s examine now how some national bibliographic agencies have acted, in an overview with no claim to exhaustivity, that reveals convergences and disagreements. We show present prevailing trends for some more problematic categories of personal authors, referring to the appendix for a limited but emblematic series of examples:

a. Classical Greek authors take a transliterated form of the Greek form or the Latin form of tradition (permitted by the IMCE12), or a variety of presently current linguistic forms that correspond to the different usage in single countries (see example for Lucian of Samosata in the appendix).

b. Classical Latin authors take the Latin form of tradition or a variety of current linguistic forms, corresponding to the different usage in each country, with the added variation that the modern name is reduced to a single name or keeps its tria nomina in the translation (see example for Virgil).

c. Fathers of the Church and Medieval western authors take either the Latin form or one of the current linguistic forms (see example for saint Augustine).

d. Other ancient and medieval authors, known in the west in the Latin form, take that form (permitted by the IMCE13), or a variety of current linguistic forms that correspond to different usage in each country (see examples for Confucius, Avicenna, Maimonides in the appendix).

e. Modern and contemporary authors enjoy a more homogeneous treatment on the whole, yet variants proliferate in the case of an author whose name is in a non-Roman alphabet. In fact international transliteration standards are not universally carried out14 and headings for modern authors are given

8 Ibid, cit., p. 54.
9 Ibid, cit., p. 55.
10 Ibid, p. 56-57.
11 Ibid, cit., p. 58.
14 The ISO norm for Greek, for example, dates back to 1997; see: Information and documentation: conversion of Greek characters into Latin characters / International Organization for Standardization. – Gènève : ISO, 1997. The norm
the widest variety of forms by the diverse bibliographic agencies, specifically for Greek (see example for Ritsos), Russian (see example for Chekhov) and Slavic in general (in Cyrillic alphabet), Arabic, Turkish, Iranian (see example for Nizami), Indian and Malay, Chinese (see example for Cao Xueqin), Japanese, Korean etc. Ancient and medieval authors of these traditions present a number of different forms often increased by the multiplicity of names attributed to them both by the traditions of their original countries and by the countries of bibliographic agencies (see example for Jalal al-Din Rumi).

f. Popes take either the Latin form or one of the current linguistic forms, with the added problem of the ordinal number used as proper element in the heading or as element in the qualifier; a further variation is presented by the heading Catholic Church with the Pope's name as subheading, giving prominence to his role, not to him as individual, and building up in the catalogue the corpus of works ascribed to the Church by a sequel of elements of a classifying type in the heading (Catholic Church, Pope, years of office, name as Pope) according to the sequence of Supreme Pontiffs (see example for Paul VI).

g. Saints take either the Latin form or the original form of the name or one of the current linguistic forms, with variations also related to entry-word that several codes establish to be the forename instead of the most relevant element of the name, chosen according to general usage in the country the saint belongs to (see examples for Thomas More, Edith Stein).

Headings for personal authors also vary in the use of distinguishing qualifiers in the case of homonyms. Besides differences in the qualifiers' language, usually the main language of the country where the library is located, some codes have rules for systematic qualification of particular categories of headings (e.g., sovereigns, saints, popes) not agreed upon by everyone, hence, not applied by some bibliographic agencies. In a general sense, the most obvious difference is in the alternation or combination between the use of dates of birth and death and the use of a title, profession, or another noun distinguishing the person. The addition of the dates of birth and death to already unique headings (an option, for example, in AACR2R 22.17A) is a basic divergence (because it is not foreseen in the Paris Principles and does not answer the catalogue functions). To distinguish a personal author, that has possible homonymous forms not yet known or real, other agencies keep additions of dates in the authority record. The addition of the full form as a qualifier to a heading with initials, whose full form is known, (e.g., Johnson, A.H. (Allison Heartz) and Johnson, A.H. (Arthus Henry), see AACR2R 22.18A), is also used in some countries. This is an apparently contradictory solution, because it chooses a short form that is inadequate and needs to be made unique by the addition of the full form, yet consistent because: first, it obeys the general rule to use the most frequently used form, which leads one to select the form with initials and then, to avoid homonymous forms, it distinguishes the headings with the most obvious element – the full form of the name – the solution best identifying the two authors. The addition of a qualifier to names that do not need it is optional in the 1988 and later revisions of AACR2.

The treatment of corporate bodies by national bibliographic agencies

It would take too long to analyze all types of headings for works entered under the name of a corporate body, assessing rules and practices by national agencies a quarter century after Corporate headings, Eva Verona's seminal comparative study and after Form and structure of corporate headings, openly related to the form of headings for corporate bodies. We are freed from this task mostly by the work already done by the Working Group on the Revision of FSCH, Form and structure of corporate headings, IFLA Section on Cataloguing, published in 2001 in the report Structures of corporate name headings, where headings under corporate replaces the previous one, dated 1968. Even the ISO has competing standards for transliteration of some languages and there is no true internationally agreed standard.

The case for the Polish philosopher Edith Stein is a heap of complications, for the rule of the forename of saints. She wrote mainly in German under her name in the German form Edith, not in the Polish Edyta. When she was declared a saint (in 1998), the uniform heading has been changed by many national agencies from Stein, Edith to Edith Stein. But she was a nun and had changed name to Schwester Teresa Benedicta a Cruce (in 1934), so the name as a saint is Teresa Benedicta a Cruce, in Latin, the language chosen in the order of Carmelite Nuns, or in other languages into which it has been translated (Teresa Benedicta vom Kreuz, Teresa Benedykta od Krzyza, Thérèse Benedicta de la Croix, Teresa Benedetta della Croce, Teresa Benedicta of the Cross, Teresa Benedicta de la Cruz, Teresa Benedicta da Cruz ...), but this name appeared only in few original manifestations of her last works, and is not nowadays established in general usage. Actually the Polish national library enters her works under Teresa Benedykta od Krzyza (eww. ; 1891-1942).

Structures of corporate name headings: final report, November 2000 / IFLA Section on Cataloguing, Working Group
bodies are analyzed in their structure, and brought back to eight categories, starting from the simple name in direct form to the name built with the addition of qualifiers, and compared with plenty of examples taken from various bibliographic agencies. The study also takes into account formal aspects like the layout and the use of punctuation marks that previous works neglected, leaving their treatment to local needs. There are reported the particular forms of heading cited above, and envisaged by the Anglo-American rules and other national codes for public administration executives and for religious dignitaries, for synods of a religious body and for company conferences, that add to the name of a body, in the first case, a term stating its office, the dates of tenure, and the name of the person who holds or held the office (e.g., United States. President (1993- : Clinton)\(^7\)), in other cases, the name of the synod or conference, its ordinal number, the date and the place (e.g., International Labour Organization. Regional Conference (2 : 1968 : Geneva)\(^8\)). It is unusual and not traditional for Italian rules and other national codes, to bring together, in a heading, the name of a body and the name of a person holding a temporary office in it and acting in its stead, or the name of a temporary body, though the latter might be considered an extensive combination of section 9.1 and 9.61 of the Paris Principles.\(^9\)

As for the present practice of national bibliographic agencies, we only notice some typical differences due to traditional problems related to headings for corporate bodies:

a. the use of geographic names persists not only for territorial jurisdictions and their organs but also for corporate bodies of a different nature located in a place or over the whole country, such as the church's territorial provinces, for which the Italian cataloguing rules (Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori, RICA\(^20\)) suggest inverted name with the place name followed by the qualifier; the prevailing practice in other codes prefers the direct form subordinated to the name of the church (see example for diocese in the appendix);

b. for subordinate bodies we find the alternatives to choose either the direct form or the form with the superior body in first position and the subordinate body as subheading;

c. the heading for corporate bodies divided into sections or having local branches varies, for these local entities, among three possibilities: 1. use of a local subheading; 2. addition of a geographical qualifier to the name of the body, 3. incorporation into the name of the body itself;

d. for religious orders we find the official name, or the short name of the order, or the current name of its members, with the added variations between original and local language for each of the three solutions (see example for Franciscans).

Among the qualifiers for headings under corporate bodies the ones added to corporate bodies whose name does not clearly show that it is a corporate body seem particularly problematic: the stated rules agree but are obviously generic and the results are far from homogeneous (e.g., Beatles (Gruppo musicale) or simply Beatles).

Roles as parts of heading or as relationships

We find other differences in the formalization of headings in the borderland between choice and form of heading.

Some codes envisage adding to the heading a function (or “role”) designation, if other than proper authorship, for compilers, editors, illustrators, translators, arrangers etc. AACR2R 21.0D consider it an
option for added entries headings; the French norm AFNOR Z 44-059, on the contrary, is structurally hinged on the difference between headings with and without function designation. These practices are not encoded in international agreements, they can be justified as systems to distinguish the different categories of an author’s responsibility without separating the access points to him. They do not deal with the form of heading but actually modify it, yet the uniform heading itself should be the same for any function performed by the same person or body; so the right conceptual place for a function designation is as a device to indicate the relationship between author entity and bibliographical entity (as a norm, the expression of a work, in FRBR’s terms).

**Multiple bibliographic identity**

Neither collective pseudonyms nor authors with *double (or multiple) bibliographic identities*, entered under different headings for each identity, according to AACR2R 22.2B2, receive a homogeneous treatment. The AACR2R rule states: “If a person has established two or more bibliographic identities, as indicated by the fact that works of one type appear under one pseudonym and works of other types appear under other pseudonyms or the person’s real name, choose, as the basis for the heading for each group of works, the name by which works in that group are identified. Make references to connect the names. In case of doubt, do not consider a person to have separate bibliographic identities”. For example, a person writing novels under a pseudonym as well as using his/her own name for scientific publications, would be given headings for both the pseudonym and his/her real name, linked by reciprocal cross references.

The issue is not new and can be summarized into a basic question: does the catalogue want to collocate together the works of a personal author (a biographic identity), regardless of the various pseudonyms or variant forms of names he/she has used on publications, or does it rather aim at collocating the works of diverse types characterized by different names on publications under each name (i.e., each bibliographic identity)?

The solution of double (or multiple) bibliographic identity is an intermediate version between two main choices that, at the ICCP in Paris, recommended: the one headings reflecting the name as it appears in the editions, with references among the different forms (principle of bibliographic unit), the other a uniform heading for all editions of all works, with reference from each other form (principle of literary unit).

The advantages of the double (multiple) bibliographic identity are: enabling immediate research access starting from the author’s name most likely found from a citation or on a manifestation, and organizing the entries related to a single group of works, the disadvantages: double (multiple) search to access the other works of the person that are always separate in the catalogue.

The advantage of uniform heading in the sense of the *Paris Principles* (the second cited) is: immediate access to all the works of a person, collocated together in the catalogue. The *disadvantages*: double search for the user starting from the name that has not been chosen as uniform heading, and difficulty in sorting out subgroups of works of that person.

Section 6.2 of the *Paris Principles* (written at the time of the card catalogue) admits the possibility of added entries instead of references “under other names or forms of name for the same author […] for example when a particular group of works is associated with a particular name”. In this way we get the advantages of both systems with the disadvantage of a duplication of entries (main entry under the uniform heading, added entry under the other one). A.H. Chaplin had proposed “full added entries” for the works published under the name not chosen for the main entry. L. Brummel, director of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek, the Hague, had proposed to accept the author's will and not to enter under the same name works of different type, revealing the identity he wanted to hide under a pseudonym. The line proposed by S. Lubetzky prevailed.22

---

22 The possibility is mentioned by Alberto Petrucciani: “In these cases we have not a formal variant but a multiplication of literary personalities who could legitimately be considered separate authors”. *Funzione e struttura del catalogo per autore* / di Alberto Petrucciani. – Firenze : Giunta regionale toscana : La nuova Italia, 1984, cit. p. 38. On this point Michael Gorman cites into it the authority of Charles A. Cutter: “My belief is that the fundamentalist interpreters of Cutter have always misinterpreted him on this point. When Cutter speaks of bringing together all the works by one author I believe this can be read as meaning that we should bring together all the works by one bibliographic identity. If Lewis Carroll is a separate bibliographic identity from that of Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, then one should have two records, one for each of them. Obviously they should be linked for the small minority who wishes to read the works of both”. *Authority control in the prospective catalog* / Michael Gorman. // *Authority control : the key to tomorrow’s catalog : proceedings of the 1979 Library and Information Technology Association Institutes* / edited by Mary W. Ghiks. – Phoenix : Oryx Press, 1982, p. 173.

AACR later abandoned Lubetzky's line and at rule 42B, footnote 5, stated: “If the works of a person appear under several pseudonyms (or under the real name and one or more pseudonyms), enter each work under the name he used for it. Make references to connect the names”; thus fully endorsing the thesis of headings based on the names found on manifestations, far beyond the exception contemplated for cases of names corresponding to groups of works.

The annotated edition of *Statement of principles* reminds the validity of the principle of uniform heading also for pseudonyms and of the added heading under the name used for a particular type of works. The example of Dodgson/Carroll is clearly presented: main heading for all works under *Carroll*, added heading under *Dodgson* for mathematical works and pamphlets.

Rule 22.2C2 of AACR2 (1978 edition) adheres to the uniform heading: “If the works of a person appear under several pseudonyms (or under the real name and one or more pseudonyms), choose one of those names if the person has come to be identified predominantly by that name in later editions of his or her works, in critical works, or in other reference sources (in that order of preference). Make references from the other names”. Then later in the rules, “If a person using pseudonyms is not known predominantly by one name, choose as the basis for the heading for each item the name appearing in it. Make references to connect the names” (22.2C3).

Clearly the change of mind is not wholly satisfying: the 1988 revision of AACR2 (compared to the 1978 edition) reintroduces multiple headings, although in the reasoned detailed way seen above. The coherent continuous distribution of names on groups of different types of works is taken as proof of the author's will to establish different bibliographic identities; the forms appearing in the different groups of works are taken as basis to distinguish multiple headings, instead of the single personal identity, moving the choice of the name from the one by which the person is generally known to the one by which works of a given type are known (AACR2R marks the exception in the general rule on the choice of name, rule 22.1).

The move is conceptually relevant, bibliographic identity and personal identity are treated as equal, the issue becomes choice of heading, not form of name, so much so that one group of works is separated from another. It is not enough to note and confirm that “The concept of catalogographic author (or of author from the catalogographic point of view) is very ample”, because extension of the concept of author concerns the attribution of the relation between author and work beyond the real intellectual responsibility, it never concerns the relation between the author's personal identity and the name used in his or her publications (bibliographic identity).

The solution is in favour of immediate user access based on the renown of the name used on the manifestations of an author’s works and refers with ‘see also’ for the indication of the complexity and totality of the person's work. The solution of AACR2R seems only a little better motivated ideologically than the one at 6.2 of the Paris Principles, and it comes almost thirty years later, with the only advantage, presently almost useless in the electronic catalogue, of saving a few added entries. As a consequence, adopting this rule poses some more problems: what is a type of works? Are groups of articles, editorials, reviews, etc., types different from books? Textual works versus works in other forms of expression? Is not double bibliographic identity valid also for people who change their name (who, in a way, change identity), provided this is associated with a difference in the type of works? Is the rule valid for those who used different names for different types of works in a wholly casual way or under pressure, without any will to establish a different bibliographic identity, except, in some cases, in order to avoid a tragic end? Must authors of the past have their works redistributed under the pseudonyms they used although they are unanimously and openly attributed to them and no one remembers they were published under a pseudonym? Is an author who has written only two works of a different type under different names a multiple author? To which bibliographic identity must we attribute posthumous editions of notebooks, letters, diaries that represent the author as a human being and on which he established no bibliographic identity? And are complete works, collections of works belonging to the two types, entered under the title with added entries for the two bibliographic identities, as if they were collections of works by two different persons (according to AACR2R 21.7B1)? The author's will seems a means to cover up the real reason for the rule: the prevailing renown of the names used for the different types of works.

---

24 *Statement of principles*, cit, p. 20.
25 Ibid., cit, p. 36.
26 “A label that can be used as an effective tool to retrieve works by an author, works attributed to him, spurious works entered under him, collections of images of his art works (e.g., reproductions of Michelangelo's drawings, of Niccolò Pisano's sculptures), even occasional publications, festschrift in his honour and publications of letters addressed mainly or only to him”. *Catalogazione* / Mauro Guerrini. – Roma : Associazione italiana biblioteche, 1999, p. 56-57.
The double (multiple) bibliographic identity is an abnormal criteria in the catalogue, as such perhaps it misleads more than it helps: under the other authors who wrote different types of works there is no device to collocate works by type; for every other author the rule is to find all the works and editions under one name.

Looking at our national solution of the problem discussed, the corresponding Italian rule in *Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori*, on the contrary, sounds too rigid. It states “Di un autore che usa uno pseudonimo per un certo tipo di opere e il nome reale per tutte le altre, si preferisce il nome reale”27 [when an author uses a pseudonym for a particular type of works and the real name for all other works, the real name is preferred], so that we must choose a little known name (*Dodgson*) not used in the best known and widely spread work (*Alice*), instead of the better identifying name (*Carroll*) linked to the best known works. However the best solution perhaps is to bring back the cases of multiple identity to the general rules for “authors whose names vary” (the name by which the author is most frequently identified ...).

The next rule in AACR2R: “If a contemporary author uses more than one pseudonym or his or her real name and one or more pseudonyms, use, as the basis for the heading for each work, the name appearing on it. Make references to connect the names”(22.2B3) takes to its extreme the preference for the pure bibliographic datum and implies the end of the principle of uniform heading for a person. Contemporaneousness may mean that the author, and his names, are not well established yet, but the fact itself that the personal identity of two pseudonyms has been recognized as concurrent seems sufficient reason for uniting the works in the catalogue. Otherwise not to stress the information attained and verified in the catalographic enquiry and to give it only by references would seem a wrong surrender.28

**Considerations**

After presenting the partly concordant, partly discordant solutions to the problems related to the form of headings, let’s try and convey some conclusive considerations on the issue. A basic question is: what catalogue are we referring to? A constant strain is perceived between local (of single libraries) and international (of bibliographic agencies) demands and a difficulty in reconciling them. In fact preference has been given, by turns, to vernacular forms of the single countries and the language of the catalogue compilers or to the original forms and to the language of the authors' countries of origin. As a consequence we have, in the first case, headings not uniform in the international field but useful in the local one, in the second, uniform headings functional for international exchange but more complex for local users. In the present situation where we have global sharing of information through networks and communication protocols, can *authority control* be limited to the local horizon of the library system or must it widen its scope to the bibliographic universe? Does the national bibliographic agency control national authors or all authors? According to the original program for universal bibliographic control the names of all authors should be controlled, of course, but in different ways:

1. at the national level with a "decision making power" on the authoritative forms of names of authors and titles of anonymous works conferred to each bibliographic agency by other agencies' consent and approval;
2. at the international level by acceptance of the headings produced by "sister" agencies with consequent exchange of headings among them.

We have been left with the issue of authors not confined to a nation (or previous to the birth of nations) since no one has competence over them and if the language criterion cannot be applied to them, the doubt remains between adopting the local form or the one traditionally accepted.29

The *Guidelines for authority and reference entries*, GARE (1984) stated the need for control activities on forms of names and offered methodological provisions in view of producing uniform records that can be exchanged and shared, but, as we have noticed:

1. the original forms are not always respected and are substituted by vernacular forms;
2. scripts used in different countries vary and transliterations do not agree;
3. identification of headings produced by different agencies is not fully attainable.

---

27 See RICA 51.6.
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It is objected, against the strictly bibliographic motives, that it is not suitable to inflict on the local patron the use of forms adopted at international level. The attempt to reconcile local cultural-linguistic needs with the corresponding needs of other countries is too great a disadvantage for use functions. After years of experience, the consideration by IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN reached this conclusion: the objective of worldwide adoption of identical headings by all is not tenable. The 2001 revised *Guidelines for authority records and references*, GARR change the philosophy behind authority control and access to bibliographic records. The “uniformity” criterion is outdated in favour of one or more authorized headings related to the same entity, equal to each other but each suitable to different cultural environments and compiled according to different rules. Their equivalence at international level corresponds to the authority record of the single agency that links its authorized form to the ”parallel” authorized forms, compiled according to other rules and according to other languages and scripts. The linking of different forms in the authority record is the condition for transferring the local forms into the scholarly internationally valid form (the *forme savante à valeur internationale* we can see in the records by the Bibliothèque nationale de France) and into other local forms or vice-versa. The method allows greater freedom to address local needs as well as recognition of equivalent forms in various national languages and traditions. The objective of linguistic uniformity is bypassed at international level. We pursue neither the unique language (yesterday's Latin, today's English) nor placing languages side by side, where everyone speaks one's own language and should understand all the other ones, actually ending up with no communication at all. Thus work on access point control becomes the work of an interpreter who must no longer pronounce the right name (authority), but must link together the various names used (authorized). The searcher too must no longer guess the right name in its precise form but has the interpreter at his disposal who translates his query to the catalogue.

In each national context we still face the issue of which form must be defined as standard, a theoretical as well as practical issue in view of effective functionality. The electronic catalogue provides direct access to all records linked to an author (or a title) through any recorded form in the authority record, thus the cluster heading reduces a great amount of problems related to information retrieval with respect to both the first and the second function of the *Paris Principles*. This does not mean that the task of choosing an authorized standard form in that very context, against other non-standard forms, to be used only as secondary access, becomes useless.

Choosing the standard form according to consistent criteria gives orderly filed headings in browsable lists with the advantage of implementing the identification and selection of names as a default for users and the maintenance of the catalogue for librarians. The authority work, especially the attention to exact terms and sequencing of elements stay the same, the adoption of local forms and the equivalence of foreign forms limit the burden of this basic task that can, at the same time, lead to better results:

a. more ease in the use of the catalogue,
b. better accuracy of research.

Nor should we forget, in concluding, that changeable and inadequate reference sources at our disposal for cataloguing activities have been a serious check in establishing consistent uniform headings: neither the most frequently used name nor the best known name can be quickly inferred from the catalogued item, but only by consulting reference works. They still are the basic means to find out and link the forms adopted by other agencies as well as to take and implement our choices and make them known. To state valid sources: biographies, encyclopedias, disciplinary reference tools, with exact information about the order of preference in case of disagreement, is a guarantee of consistency for the cataloguer and of clarity for the user. Ever more we have at our disposal new tools and can expect a lot from the work begun with GARR that, if correctly understood by national agencies, might lead to the creation, upkeeping, and availability of high-quality authority files. The exchange of records then becomes link or exchange or sharing of archives, or rather their integration into a unifying structure that contains all the authority records and links the ones related to the same entity, thereby being the virtual international authority file Barbara Tillett was talking about this morning.

30 Consulting *Names of persons*, 1996, it appeared that out of 105 bibliographic agencies, only 29 gave an affirmative answer when asked if they had an authority file for personal names (including answers like “it is under development”).
Appendix

HEADINGS BY TEN DIVERSE NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC AGENCIES: COMPARISONS

For each issue dealt with an example is given, with variant forms of an author's name. The authority of headings lies in the fact they are taken consulting ten national bibliographic agencies (nine European plus the Library of Congress); here is a list of their acronyms:

BL British Library (United Kingdom)
BnF Bibliothèque nationale (France)
DB Deutsche Bibliothek (Germany)
HR Croatia
IT Italy
LC Library of Congress (USA)
NOR Norway
POR Portugal
SP Spain
SV Sweden

In each example the number of variants is given within parenthesis after the example's title, the headings are ordered alphabetically. A missing acronym means the name was not found in that catalogue. Punctuation has been considered a distinctive enough element to signal a variant. For Edith Stein the Polish heading has been added (POL).

Classical Greek authors

LUCIAN OF SAMOSATA (7)
–Lucian, of Samosata BL, LC
–Luciano de Samosata SP
–Luciano de Samosata, ca. 130-200 POR
–Lucianus IT, SV
–Lucianus <Samosatensis> DB
–Lucianus Samosatensis HR, NOR
–Lucien de Samosate forme courante français
  Lucianus Samosatensis forme savante à valeur internationale latin BnF

Classical Latin authors

VIRGIL (5)
–Vergilius Maro, Publius DB, IT, NOR, HR, SV
–Virgil BL, LC
–Virgile forme courante français
  Vergilius Maro, Publius forme savante à valeur internationale latin BnF
–Virgilio Marón, Publio SP
–Virgilio, 70-19 a.C. POR

Fathers of the Church and medieval western authors

SAINT AUGUSTINE (8)
–Agostinho, Santo, 354-430 POR
–Agustin, Santo, Obispo de Hipona SP
–Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo BL, LC
–Augustinus (saint) BnF
–Augustinus, Aurelius DB, HR
Other ancient and medieval authors known in the West by the Latin form

CONFUCIUS (6)
- Confucio
- Confucius
- Kong, Qiu
- Kong, Qiu (551 av. J.C.-479 av. J.C.) forme savante à valeur internationale système ISO

AVICENNA (6)
- Avicena
- Avicen
- Avicenna
- Avicenne forme courante Ibn Sina, Al Husayn ibn Abd Allah forme savante à valeur internationale ISO

MAIMONIDES (7)
- Maimonide, Moise
- Maimonides
- Maimónides
- Maimonides, 1135-1204
- Maimonides, Moses
- Moise Maimonide forme savante à valeur internationale

RITSOS (8)
- Ritsos, Giannes
- Ritsos, Giannès, 1909-1990
- Ritsos, Giannis
- Ritsos, Giannis (1909-1990) forme courante autre système de translitt. à valeur internationale

CHEKHOV (9)
- Chechov, A.P.
- Chechov, Anton
- Chechov, Anton Pavlovic (Tjechov, Anton)
- Chekhov, Anton Pavlovic
- Chechov, Anton Pavlovich
- Chekhov, Anton Pavlovich (1860-1904)
- Chekhov, A. P. (Anton Pavlovich) 1860-1904
- Tchekhov, Anton Pavlovitch (1860-1904) forme courante autre système de translitt. à valeur internationale

Modern and contemporary authors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Forme</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIZAMI GANJAVI (9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nezami-e Ganjavi</td>
<td>forme savante à valeur intern. système propre à l'Agence bibliographique (BnF)</td>
<td>BnF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizami</td>
<td>IT, SV1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizâmi</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizâmi Gangawi</td>
<td>SV2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizâmi Gangawi, Ilyâs Ibn-Yusuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizami Ganjavi</td>
<td>NOR, SV3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizami Ganjavi, 1140 or 41-1202 or 3</td>
<td>BL, LC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizami, Ganjavi</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizami-yi Ganjah'i, Hakim</td>
<td>SV4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAO XUEQIN (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao, Hsie Kin</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao, Xueqin</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao, Xueqin (1715?-1763?)</td>
<td>forme savante à valeur internationale</td>
<td>BnF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao, Xueqin, 1715?-1763</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao, Xueqin, ca. 1717-1763</td>
<td>LC, SV1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao, Zhan</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsaq Chan</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsaq, Hsueh-Chin</td>
<td>POR, SP, SV2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JALAL AL-DIN RUMI (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal al-Djin Rumj</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal-ad-Din Rumi</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal al-Din Rumi</td>
<td>forme savante à valeur internationale système propre à l'Agence bibliogr.</td>
<td>BnF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal al-Din Rumi, Maulana</td>
<td>NOR, SV1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal al-Din Rumi, Mawalana</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jal al-Din Rumi, Mawalana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumi, 1207-1273</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumi, Galaladdine</td>
<td>SV2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumi, Jalal al-Din, 1207-1273</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalal al-Din Rumi</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul VI (9 + 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igreja Católica. Papa, 1963-1978 (Paulo VI)</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo VI, Papa</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul 6, pave, 1897-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul VI (pape)</td>
<td>forme courante français</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus VI (pape) nom en religion forme savante à valeur internationale latin</td>
<td>BnF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul VI, Pope, 1897-1978</td>
<td>BL, LC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Church. Pope (1963-1978 : Paul VI)</td>
<td>BL, LC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus &lt;papa ; 6.&gt;</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus &lt;Papa, VI.&gt;</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus VI</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus VI, [pave]</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THOMAS MORE (9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More, Thomas DB, HR
More, Thomas, Sir, Saint, 1478-1535 BL, LC
Morus, Thomas, 1478-1535 POR
Thomas More (saint) forme savante à valeur internationale BnF
Thomas More, helgen NOR
Thomas More, helgon SV1
Thomas More, sir, Saint SV2
Thomas: More <santo> IT
Tomás Moro, Santo (1478-1535) SP

EDITH STEIN (7 + 1)
-Edith, Stein, santa SP
-Edith : Stein <santa> IT
-Stein, Edith DB, HR, NOR
-Stein, Edith, Saint, 1891-1942 LC
-Stein, Edith, 1891-1942 BL, POR
-Stein, Edith (1891-1942) forme savante à valeur internationale BnF
-Stein, Edith, 1891-1942, helgon SV
-Teresa Benedykta od Krzyza (œw. ; 1891-1942) POL

CORPORATE BODIES

DIOCESE
-Banjalucka biskupija HR
-Catholic Church. Archdiocese of Milan (Italy)
-Catholic Church. Archdiocese of Milan. Italy
  Milan, Diocese of [old editions]
  Catholic church. Diocese of Northampton BL
-Church of England. Diocese de Chester NOR
-Diözese <Aachen> DB
-Église catholique. Diocèse (Paris) BnF
-Lisboa. Diocese POR
-Milán (Archidiócesis). Arzobispo (1979- : Carlo M. Martini) SP
  Martini, Carlo M. (1927-)
-Milano (Arcidiocesi) IT

FRANCISCANS (8)
- Francescani IT
- Franciscanos SP
- Franciscans BL, LC
- Franjeveci HR
- Franciskanorden SV
- Ordem dos Frades Menores POR
- Ordo Fratrum Minorum DB
- Ordre des Frères mineurs forme courante
  Ordo Fratrum minorum forme savante à valeur internationale latin BnF

Separate bibliographic identities

DODGSON/CARROLL
Uniform heading for personal identity:
-Carroll, Lewis DB, NOR, HR, SV
-Carroll, Lewis (1832-1898) BnF
-Carroll, Lewis, pseud. POR
–Dodgson, Charles Lutwidge

Uniform heading for bibliographic identity:

–Carroll, Lewis (1832-1898)
  Dodgson, Charles Lutwidge (1832-1898)
–Carroll, Lewis, 1832-1898
  Dodgson, Charles Lutwidge, 1832-1898