

First IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code
July 28 - 30, 2003, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Updated: July 15, 2003

Working Group 2
Corporate Bodies

Background Paper¹

Corporate bodies from ICCP up to 2003

by
Mauro Guerrini
with the assistance of Pino Buizza and Lucia Sardo

Corporate authorship before ICCP

The concept of corporate authorship evolved inside the Anglo-American cataloguing tradition.² The use of some corporate entries was codified firstly by Antonio Panizzi in his 91 rules³; the concept of

¹ For the treatment of corporate bodies by cataloguing rules, cf. the papers about them on the meeting homepage.

² For an historical overview of corporate authorship before ICCP cf. Eva Verona, *A historical approach to corporate entries*; James A. Tait, *Authors and title*; and Michael Carpenter, *Corporate authorship: its role in library cataloging*. Corporate entries were a long lasting practice (from the beginning of the XVII century), before their statement in Panizzi's rules. Their origin did not result from a supposed equivalence between personal and corporate author; it should be mostly related to the presence of the names of corporate bodies in titles, where anonymous and collective works were entered under the title (and the most or the first important word of the title) or under the subject; and the name of a corporate body actually was the most or the first important word of the title, or was the subject. An example is in *Catalogus impressorum librorum bibliothecae Bodleianae in Academia Oxoniensi*, published in 1674 by Thomas Hyde, where "we can note the increasing achievement of corporate headings, often corresponding to Latin names of cities, countries, institutions; acting both as authors and as subjects, headings aggregating anonymous or collective works". We can find: *Anglia, Jesuita, & Societas Jesu, Londinum, Parisiensis Academia*, and so on; or *Brescia*, for the anonymous title *Il sontuoso apparato fatto dalla città di Brescia nel ritorno delle [sic] Vescovo suo Cardinale Morosini* [The sumptuous array made by the town of Brescia at the return of the Bishop Cardinal Morosini] (cf. Alfredo Serrai, *Storia della bibliografia, 7: Storia e critica della catalogazione bibliografica*, Roma, Bulzoni, 1997, p. 237).

³ The 91 Rules for the compilation of the catalogue of the British Museum issued by Antonio Panizzi in 1841 do not deal with corporate authorship. Rule XXXIV makes explicit the tradition cited above: "When no such name of a person appears, then that of an assembly, corporate body, society, board, party, sect, or denomination appearing on the title to be preferred, subject to the arrangement of Rule IX; and if no such name appear, then that of any country, province, city, town or place so appearing, to be adopted as the heading"; missing a personal author, Panizzi looks for a main entity, the name of a corporate body or of a place, in the title (at time meaning the whole wording of the title page), not for the authorship of the work. After this choice, Rule IX "Any act, resolution, or other document purporting to be agreed upon, authorized or issued by assemblies boards or corporate bodies (with the exception of academies, universities, learned societies and religious orders ...) to be entered in distinct alphabetical series, under the name of the country or place from which they derive their denomination, or, for want of such denomination, under the place from whence their acts are issued" is only a matter of entry word and of arrangement: the name of a corporate body may not

corporate authorship was suggested and adopted by Charles Coffin Jewett⁴ and elevated to the level of principle and developed into a complete set of rules by Charles Ammi Cutter in the fourth edition of *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue*.⁵ That very end of the century the German refusal of corporate entries was clearly stated by Karl Dzitzko⁶; in Italy, on the contrary, their traditional usage was coded by Giuseppe Fumagalli in his cataloguing rules⁷.

Lubetzky

With his *Code of cataloguing rules, author and title entry: an unfinished draft* (1960), Seymour Lubetzky states the general rule for authorship: 'The work of a person, whatever the character or the medium by which it is presented, I entered under the name of the person as author of the work presented' (Rule 1).

Perhaps one of the most distinctive features of CCR is its treatment of corporate bodies, particularly the abandonment of the distinction between societies and institutions that had bedevilled former codes. As a result, all corporate bodies are entered under their names. As far as possible, Lubetzky attempts to bring corporate authorship within the framework of personal authorship, but with certain

be a heading. Headings different from personal names should be names of places, under which the names of corporate bodies are collected "in distinct alphabetical series"; or titles, which we are not dealing with here; or formal headings such as "Academies" (Rule LXXX), "Periodical Publications" (Rule LXXXI), "Ephemerides" (Rule LXXXII). Under the first of these formal headings the entries are arranged by continent, by states, by cities, and only at last alphabetically by the names of the academies. The only rule that provides for a corporate entry, independently from the presence of the name in the title and on the basis of a formal distinction of publications, is Rule XLVII: "General collections of laws, edicts, ordinances, or other public acts of similar description, to be entered under the name of state or nation in which or by whom they were sanctioned, signed, or promulgated". There is no acknowledgement of corporate authorship, and, apart from states, the names of corporate bodies are only used as subordinate devices for filing entries. (Corporate authors and the cataloguing of official publication' / Yvonne Ruyssen, Suzanne Honoré. – In: *Journal of documentation*. – Vol. 13, no. 3, p. 132-146).

⁴ The principle of corporate authorship was firstly suggested in 1852 by Charles Coffin Jewett, in *On the construction of catalogues of libraries, and of a general catalogue and their publication by means of separate, stereotyped titles with rules and examples*. Rule XXII considers any kind of corporate body to be the author of the works it issues. Following this point of view Jewett prefers direct entry under the name of the body to entry either under a catchword in the name of the body, or to some substitute for the name of the body: place or country, or to a formal heading.

⁵ C.A. Cutter evolved his idea of corporate authorship, but the principles he had laid down in 1876 were modified little by his later codes. In the fourth edition, *Rules for a dictionary catalogue*, 1904, he put forward two reasons for adopting corporate authorship: "as a matter of fact these bodies are authors not only of their proceedings but also of their collections regarded as a whole ... as a matter of convenience ... it is better that all the books connected with the name of a society or government should be brought together in one place" (p. 40). The definition of Author recalls Jewett's rule: 'Bodies of men (societies, cities, legislative bodies, countries) are to be considered the authors of their memoirs, transactions, journals, debates, reports, etc.' (p. 14) Cutter was defending corporate authorship in the face of the German practice of regarding all such publications as anonymous, and entering them under the first independent noun of their titles. Rule 45 states: 'Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority'. In the following rules are included details and specifications for particular kinds of corporate bodies, so that the matter is systematically dealt with. In short, we could recognize that Cutter assumed the concept of corporate authorship as parallel to personal authorship, and developed it in full, taking so the most important step towards modern cataloguing practice. Later codes such as the Anglo-American code (1908), and the one by the American Library Association (1949), took for granted Cutter's principle of corporate authorship, and focused on the form of the names of corporate bodies. There derived four recognized groups of corporate bodies: governments, societies, institutions, and miscellaneous bodies.

⁶ In his *Instruction für die Ordnung der Titel im Alphabetischen Zettelkatalog der Königlichen und Universitätsbibliothek zu Breslau*, Berlin, 1886, K. Dzitzko stated no particular rule for corporate bodies and no entry alternative to personal author or title. There appeared entries under the names of corporate bodies only as the first noun of a title, e.g., *Chaucer Society* (§110), their publications being considered anonymous.

⁷ G. Fumagalli in his *Cataloghi di biblioteche e indici bibliografici*, Firenze, 1887, accepted the Italian tradition and was partly inspired by Cutter. Rule XXXIX states "The publications issued by a political, social or religious institution, in short by a corporate body should always be entered under the name of such corporate body"; in the condensed rules, no. 27, the principle of corporate authorship is accepted "A corporate body is considered as the author of its publications" (p. 81).

qualifications (see Rule 21). Rule 22 represents a precise definition of those instances where a corporate body can be considered as the author of the publications issued under its name.

Corporate bodies at the ICCP, 1961

Corporate authorship has always been a problematic issue. The German tradition of *The Prussian Instructions* did not consider the possibility that a corporate body could be an author; while the Anglo-American tradition had a long practice of corporate headings with a distinction made between societies and institutions. The preliminary work by IFLA, starting in 1954, had prepared a convergence of these two opposing traditions. At the 1961 Paris International Conference on the Cataloguing Principles of Paris (ICCP), corporate bodies were recognised as important access points to bibliographic information. Corporate bodies were discussed on 11 and 12 October: the general principles on corporate entry were laid down in Section 9 of the *Statement of Principles*. The basis for the preliminary discussion of this issue was a working paper prepared by V.A. Vasilevskaya, the WP no. 5: 1. *Limits to the use of entries under corporate authors*. 2. *The cataloguing of laws and treaties* and by Suzanne Honoré (BnF), the WP no. 6: *Corporate authorship*. 1. *Form of heading for corporate authors*. 2. *Treatment of subordinate bodies*.⁸ For the choice of main entry the starting point of the discussion at the ICCP was:

- ‘9.1 A *corporate body* (i.e. any institution, organized body or assembly of persons known by a corporate or collective name) may be treated in the catalogue as the author of a work or serial publication
- 9.11 if the work or publication is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body, or
- 9.12 if the wording of the title or title-page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work or publication’.

Points 9.11 and 9.12 deal with works that may be authored by a corporate body: they try to compromise between those accepting the principle of collective responsibility and those who are against it: even among the former there is no full agreement about its application. Three criteria are considered relevant for defining the boundaries for the application of the concept of collective authorship; 2 and 3 must be taken in conjunction if 1 does not apply:

1. the content and purpose of the work if it is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body;
2. the presence of the name in the title or in an essential part of the title-page;
3. the collective responsibility of the corporate body for the content of the work.

Many delegates took part in the debate, among them Arthur C. Chaplin, Eva Verona, Andrew Osborn, Seymour Lubetzky, and Ákos Domanovszky. Many national delegations (e.g., Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Finland) did not agree with the principle of authorship for corporate bodies, because it was too difficult to be correctly applied by cataloguers, and because it was not useful for catalogue users. Chaplin stated that even if the majority of delegations accepted the principle of

⁸ Report / International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, 9th-18th October, 1961; [edited by A.H. Chaplin and Dorothy Anderson]. – London : International Federation of Library Associations, 1963. No. 5: 1. Limits to the use of entries under corporate authors. 2. The cataloguing of laws and treaties / by V.A. Vasilevskaya, p. 165-174, and no. 6: Corporate authorship. 1, Form of heading for corporate authors. 2, Treatment of subordinate bodies / by Suzanne Honoré: p. 175-183.

collective responsibility, there would be two different approaches to the entry under a corporate name:

1. the first takes the view that a corporate body issuing a work should be considered in the same way as a personal author;
2. the second considers that it is useful to make an added entry under the name of the corporate body, because that name is the more convenient element for identifying all the works of that corporate body, even if the principle of corporate authorship is not accepted.

For some kinds of works (namely, the ones defined in 9.11) these two different approaches do not imply any difference in treatment: this is not true for the works defined in 9.12, for which an entry is allowed only if the principle of collective responsibility is accepted. Seymour Lubetzky stressed that no difference could be made between the treatment of personal and corporate authors, since the relationship between an author and his/her work was difficult to define in both cases.

Voting on section 9.1 was: For: 56; Against: 7. The delegate from Yugoslavia was ‘quite prepared to accept [...] the alternative given in the Report of the Working Group (*Libri*, 1956, p. 291) for works which do not relate directly to the activities, functions or internal administration of the corporate body. The definition given in 9.11 is much broader than the before mentioned alternative and, moreover, rather vague’. The Swedish delegation, however regarded ‘the use of corporate entry as a very useful method of dealing with certain groups of material’. The concept of *collective responsibility* was strongly criticized because it was considered ‘vague’. When point 9.12 was voted upon, the result was: For: 50; Against: 6; Abstentions: 2.

The discussion also took account of the text of section 9.4: uniform heading for works entered under the name of a corporate body.

At the end of the discussions, the text approved by the ICCP – *Statement of Principles*, Section 9, was as follows:

9.1 The main entry for a work should be made under the name of a corporate body (i.e. any institution, organized body or assembly of persons known by a corporate or collective name),

9.11 when the work is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body,⁹ even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body, or

9.12 when the wording of the title or title-page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work.¹⁰

9.2 In other cases, when a corporate body has performed a function (such as that of an editor) subsidiary to the function of the author, an added entry should be made under the name of the corporate body.

9.3 In doubtful cases, the main entry may be made either under the name of the corporate body or under the title or the name of the personal author, with an added entry in either case under the alternative not chosen for the main entry.

9.4 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, except that

⁹ E.g. official reports, rules and regulations, **manifestos**, programmes and records of the results of collective work.

¹⁰ E.g. serials whose titles consist of a generic term (Bulletin, Transactions, etc.) preceded or followed by the name of a corporate body, and which include some account of the activities of the body.

- 9.41 if variant forms of the name are frequently found in the publications, the uniform heading should be the official form of the name;
- 9.42 if there are official names in several languages, the heading should be the name in whichever of these languages is best adapted to the needs of the users of the catalogue;
- 9.43 if the corporate body is generally known by a conventional name, this conventional name (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue) should be the uniform heading;
- 9.44 for states and other territorial authorities the uniform heading should be the currently used form of the name of the territory concerned in the language best adapted to the needs of the users of the catalogue;
- 9.45 if the corporate body has used in successive periods different names, which cannot be regarded as minor variations of one name, the heading for each work should be the name at the time of its publication, the different names being connected by references;¹¹
- 9.46 a further identifying characteristic should be added, if necessary, to distinguish the corporate body from others of the same name.
- 9.5 Constitutions, laws and treaties, and certain other works having similar characteristics, should be entered under the name of the appropriate state or other territorial authority, with formal or conventional titles indicating the nature of the material. Added entries for the actual titles should be made as needed.
- 9.6 A work of a corporate body which is subordinate to a superior body should be entered under the name of the subordinate body, except that
- 9.61 if this name itself implies subordination or subordinate function, or is insufficient to identify the subordinate body, the heading should be the name of the superior body with the name of the subordinate body as a subheading;
- 9.62 if the subordinate body is an administrative, judicial or legislative organ of a government, the heading should be the name of the appropriate state or other territorial authority with the name of the organ as a subheading.

The text presented before the debate at the ICCP explicitly reflects the principle of authorship of corporate bodies: the text approved by the ICCP deals with ‘entry under the name of a corporate body’ without any clear mention of the concept of corporate bodies as authors.

List of uniform headings for corporate bodies

After the ICCP we begin to see the start of the compilation of international authority lists of uniform headings for corporate bodies, thanks to the *Statement of Principles*, but it becomes more and more difficult over time, because of:

- the increasing number - and, most of all, the linguistic and cultural diversity - of the countries involved;
- the rules approved after the Paris Conference do not lead to the unique solutions that were expected after agreement was obtained (although not easily) on the *Statement of Principles*.

The activities (and the logic) of the UBC Programme made it fundamental to have a complete re-examination of the issue, including a review and improvements to the *Statement of Principles*, in order to achieve agreement on the form of corporate headings.

¹¹ It is a permissible alternative, when it is certain that the successive names denote the same body, to assemble all the entries under the latest name with references from the other names.

Definitive editions of authority lists

List of uniform headings for higher legislative and ministerial bodies in European countries / International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions; compiled by the USSR Cataloguing Committee. – 2nd ed. rev. – London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1979.

African legislative and ministerial bodies: list of uniform headings for higher legislative and ministerial bodies in African countries / compiled by IFLA International Office for UBC. – London: [s.n.], 1980.

Names of states: an authority list of language forms for catalogue entries / compiled by the IFLA International Office for UBC. – London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1981.

Theoretical considerations: Verona, Carpenter, Domanovszky

Eva Verona

In spite of the almost unanimous acceptance of the *Paris Principles*, we find great differences among the ‘post-Paris’ codes. The International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts in Copenhagen, 1969, recommended that the annotated edition of the *Statement* should present the solutions adopted or discussed, and encouraged the use of the original names of countries and towns in headings. In the 1971 edition Eva Verona collated national usages, and clearly demonstrated that there was a large gap between theory and practice. To narrow that gap, it was considered that further analysis was required.

At the 1972 IFLA Conference in Budapest, the Committee on Cataloguing asked Eva Verona to undertake an analysis of the current position on the issue of corporate bodies. How was the concept of ‘corporate author’ interpreted; and what were the national practices and rules? At the 1973 IFLA Conference in Grenoble, Verona presented the first results of her study, in which she acknowledged the existence of a broader concept of corporate authorship (the name of any corporate body most closely associated with a work, according to AACR), and a narrower one (e.g. the Bulgarian position: a corporate body can be used as a heading only if the form of the publication - laws, bulletins, etc. - allows it). There were also intermediate positions (only in certain, formally defined cases was it possible to consider a corporate body as the originator of the work, RAK).

Verona also suggested a definition of corporate authorship: ‘A work should be considered to be of corporate authorship if it may be concluded by its character (or by its matter) that it is necessarily the result of the creative and/or organizational activity of the corporate body as a whole and not the intellectual activity of the individuals who drafted it’. The broader concept of corporate authorship was slightly preferred by the members of the Committee.

At the 1974 IFLA Conference in Washington, D.C., the final results of the study by Eva Verona, as well as an investigation by Maria Valenti into serials headings, were presented. From Valenti’s study two different applications came to light: a main entry under the title or a main entry under the corporate body. So the investigation, which concurred with the findings of Verona’s study, was accepted as an important contribution to the issue of serial publications.

Corporate headings: their use in library catalogues and national bibliographies was published in 1975. In her introduction to the report, Verona wrote that ‘as yet no international standardisation as to application, interpretation, form and structure of corporate bodies has been achieved’, and she noted that ‘most of the procedures as prescribed by various codes or adopted by cataloguing

practices, etc., have a distinct tendency to cling to the long-standing cataloguing traditions of their own country.'¹²

The study is a critical analysis of the issues relating to corporate headings, and it focuses on the examination of theoretical studies and of the solutions adopted by cataloguing rules and national bibliographies. For every perspective of the issue she offers a complete overview of the different positions, and she compares them by presenting the pros and cons for each of them. She also indicates the solutions that are more in line with the *Paris Principles* and are more acceptable in an international context.

The first section concentrates on the definition of the corporate body for cataloguing purposes, and on the concept of the corporate author and other interpretations of corporate headings, with an analysis of the various types of documents that can be ascribed to corporate bodies.

The second section deals with the form and structure of corporate headings; it first of all addresses the general problems, which are common to all corporate headings; and then, for each type of corporate body, it goes on to analyse in depth the structure and form of the name for the heading, according to the nature of each heading.

The work is comprehensive; it also draws attention to differences in technical details such as punctuation, capitalisation, transliteration, geographic qualifiers, namely, details that go beyond cataloguing principles, and that are considered in detail only by a concrete approach typical of cataloguing codes. It is rich in examples, including some taken from pre-Paris cataloguing codes, and so it is a useful base from which not only to start work on international uniformity, but also to encourage a better understanding of cataloguing practices in the countries considered in the work.

In her conclusions, Verona presents suggestions for new agreements on corporate headings, states her (previously expressed) preferences and takes account of divergent positions with proposals for mediation. A few examples of Verona's suggestions are: 'All types of groups ... should be included in the meaning of the term ... no exceptions should be made for territorial authorities or commercial publishers'; 'Works by dignitaries produced in their official capacity should be treated as works of personal authorship' (with exception for laws); 'Laws should be entered under their title proper'; and for subordinate corporate bodies 'preference should be given to direct headings'.

If the detailed comparisons may seem to aim at the creation of an international cataloguing code (the one avoided in Paris), these suggestions, on the contrary, show that the work as a whole is situated at an intermediate level between principles and rules. On the basis of a fifteen-year-long debate, even if they are consistently interpreted and adopted, the principles seem to be implicitly recognised as producing really different headings in different countries; these different headings can be understood abroad, because they have been created according to common practices, but they are not sufficiently uniform to be placed together in an alphabetical catalogue, in order to show 'which works by a particular author and which editions of a particular work exist'. This is particularly so in the changed context of the present: the exchange of bibliographic information has increased enormously, and shared cataloguing puts side by side headings of different origin, whereas the use of computers emphasizes the need for strict formalization in order to avoid duplication of corporate headings with each variant form.

The introduction to *Structures of corporate name headings* (SCNH) reports that: 'She commented that the "complete lack of uniformity" was a very serious obstacle for effective universal bibliographic control, and argued that national barriers had to be broken down, that national and local interests should give place to international interests. Differences in practical application should be reduced to a minimum; complicated and over-elaborate rules should be avoided, as the average user would not understand them. Later research on catalogue use has confirmed that

¹² *Corporate headings: their use in library catalogues and national bibliographies: a comparative and critical study /* by Eva Verona. – London: IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1975, p. 1.

Verona also delivered a set of “Suggestions”, in which she advocated a framework in which variations dictated by national interests are eliminated and simple solutions are given’.¹³

Michael Carpenter

Michael Carpenter participated authoritatively in the theoretical debate. Could corporate bodies be considered the authors of their works? It was necessary to reflect on the concept of authorship, on the meaning of being the ‘author’ of a work. In 1981 Carpenter published a study on corporate authorship. He defined three models of authorship:

- 1) by origination or creation;
- 2) by assumption of responsibility;
- 3) by corporate utterance.

The first occurs when an author writes a text: this is an unlikely condition (even if not impossible) for a corporate body since it only would happen when all its members took part in the creation of the work. The second takes place when an author states his/her responsibility, even if he/she has not directly created the work: this is a typical situation in the case of corporate bodies that adopt or issue works written by experts. This occurs most frequently in situations where corporate bodies adopt works created by individual authors, usually on demand but sometimes because it is mandatory if the corporate body is obliged to take responsibility (cataloguing authorship) for some types of works. The third refers to corporate utterances: ‘The textual content of a work must be a corporate utterance of a corporate body in order for that body to be treated as its author’ (p. 152). Utterances, namely, all linguistic acts, oral or written, are made by individual people, but some are of no significance if they are not made in the name of the corporate body they represent. A corporate body is, however, capable of making ‘corporate utterances’ if it has a describable ratification and/or veto procedure for assuming responsibility for making certain utterances, these utterances, of course, being necessarily made in the first place by individual persons. In such cases it must be clear and certain that the utterance is a ‘corporate utterance’ by the corporate body.

Carpenter thinks that this third situation offers sufficient justification for the treatment of corporate bodies as authors: in his view it would subsume and replace the other two, and would become the only acceptable option. Thus, a corporate body is considered to be a catalogued author (a conventional author, obviously) and, therefore, its name can be an entry. Therefore, the concept of authorship can also include a corporate body, because it is responsible for the content of a publication, a content that expresses a collective will that goes beyond the will of the single person representing it, and in a particular historical context, represents it.

Ákos Domanovszky

Ákos Domanovszky defines as ‘corporate body’, ‘every union or organization, whether permanent or ephemeral, which has had a part (except in the role of a mere publisher’s or printer’s) in producing an elemental object of cataloguing (including its intellectual constituent, its content), and which is in possession of what may be considered a name’.¹⁴ He adds that difficulties arise when one tries to define the term ‘corporate author’. In fact, the word ‘responsibility’ denotes a broad scale of not only quantitatively but also qualitatively different things, and for this reason ‘very often the “chief” one among them can be determined only absolutely arbitrarily’. But while in the field of

¹³ *Structures of corporate name headings: final report, November 2000 / IFLA Section on Cataloguing, Working Group on the Revision of FSCH; compiled and introduced by Ton Heijligers.* <<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/scatn/final2000.htm>>.

¹⁴ *Functions and objects of author and title cataloguing: a contribution to cataloguing theory / Ákos Domanovszky.* – München : Verlag Dokumentation, 1975, p. 120, *passim*.

personal authorship, the formula ‘chief responsibility for the intellectual content’ is not liable to cause trouble because the everyday meaning of the word ‘author’ protects it from improper use, when it comes to treating editors, compilers and corporate bodies as authors, however, the practical consequences become quite unsatisfactory. The criterion ‘chief responsibility for the intellectual content of the book’ not only gives no clue to the handling of cases where several bodies, or bodies and personal editors or compilers, have all participated in the production of a book or work, but ‘it also frequently fails the cataloguer confronted with the task of choosing between a title entry and a corporate one’. The inability of code-makers to agree on the meaning of the term ‘corporate author’, and their failure to explain (even approximately) their differing versions of the meaning of the term, derives from the complete lack of any objective basis upon which a common definition could be founded. And this problem applies to any code: ‘Not a single code throughout the world has managed to tackle this task satisfactorily’.

Domanovszky indicates many causes for this failure. The first is that the phenomena that cataloguers have to deal with show an endless variety and combinations of forms, ‘which one may conceive as arranged [...] into a graded system displaying a high degree of continuity’. This *continuum* shows that these phenomena not only differ from each other, but also differ in degree. As a consequence it is impossible to define the boundaries of the concept of ‘corporate authorship’, since there are always ‘more or less notable contingents of cases in the world of corresponding reality, as to which it is dubious and open to dispute whether they should be subsumed under that concept and term or not’. Domanovszky concludes that ‘for the drawing of the dividing line between those corporate bodies that are to be considered and treated as “authors” and those that are not, theory and codification have not succeeded yet in discovering such an objective method’.

The second cause is that the ‘analogy between personal and corporate authorship is a mere fiction, and the application of the designation “author” to a corporate body is nothing more than a metaphor’, since corporate bodies are unable to write and compose. This is the main reason ‘why all attempts at amalgamating the two definitions [...] are doomed to fail’. Beside this, it is completely impossible to draw a sharp line of division between publications of corporate bodies that *have* been written vicariously and those that *have not*. This high degree of volatility at the boundaries of the concept is the crucial point that, in Domanovszky’s opinion, renders the concept of corporate authorship ultimately unworkable.

To sum up, Domanovszky does not see any possibility of formulating rules for the application of corporate main entries without causing an ‘inordinate occurrence of misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the intended range of their validity’; but he states that ‘if a concept of the “blurred-edge” type is in spite of its shortcomings considered a cataloguing device so useful as to be indispensable, it is possible to make use of it by means of added entries’. Nevertheless, Domanovszky sees that many librarians will consider that discarding the corporate main entry, and the very concept of corporate authorship, is unacceptable. Those librarians ‘are accustomed to regard the rules for corporate authorship as [...] a main contribution to author-title cataloguing’. But the ‘really valuable contribution consists in clearly having exploited all the possibilities of a utilization, as a handle of great worth, of the name of the corporate bodies which have had a part in the production of books or works; in [...] having recognized the aptitude of these names materially to improve the retrievability of a large and important class of objects of cataloguing; in other words, in [...] discovering the great value these names are capable of attaining in the role of formal marks.’ In Domanovszky’s opinion, the positive contribution stops here: he thinks that the development of the concept and of the formal aspect of the names (such as 1: the introduction of the concept of corporate authorship to justify the practice of corporate main entries; 2: the distinction between two classes of bodies; and 3: the development of an increasingly intricate and very artificial system of main entry under corporate bodies, and their differentiation into three different classes with a special form of heading) have diminished the value of that contribution to the point where the disadvantages have overwhelmed the benefits.

Form and structure of corporate headings (FSCH) – 1980

Considering the need for uniformity at an international level in the field of corporate headings, IFLA created a Working Group on Corporate Bodies, chaired by Lucia J. Rather, in 1976. The group used the work by Verona as a starting point with the aim of arriving at an international agreement on a set of basic principles governing form and structure of corporate headings that could be recommended for international usage, without considering the choice of main entry. At a meeting in London in 1977, the WG presented its recommendations, beginning with the consideration that ‘international standardization of form and structure of corporate headings, combined with authority files, was essential for the realisation of the UBC Programme’.¹⁵ The recommendations defined a corporate body on the basis of a particular name identifying it, and set rules limiting the cases in which an occasional group has or has not a formal name; they proposed detailed indications, general ones (e.g. the language) or detailed ones (e.g. punctuation) for the uniform heading of corporate bodies in general, and for territorial authorities in particular.

The WG sought opinions on the recommendations, and dealt with other aspects of the issue following Verona’s study. In 1978 it distributed a complete draft set of recommendations, which was then revised in the light of comments received. The recommendations, which were approved by the Section on Cataloguing and the Section on Official Publications, were then published as the IFLA standard *Form and structure of corporate headings* in 1980.

The document is structured as paragraphs (as in the ISBDs) and the typographic style is also the same as in the ISBDs. ‘The primary purpose of the recommendations is to promote uniformity in headings appearing in bibliographic records produced for international exchange within the framework of Universal Bibliographic Control. The recommendations are directed at solutions for the problems of current cataloguing, not those of retrospective catalogues’. (0.1.1). The recommendations deal only with the form of corporate headings, and do not consider the choice of entry. A paragraph of definitions specifies the meaning of those terms that are important for the correct application of the recommendations (e.g., organs and non-organs). In the text, the general recommendations precede the detailed recommendations for specific kinds of bodies.

The definition of ‘corporate body’ follows and modifies that by Verona, and it clearly differentiates between corporate bodies that can or cannot be used in a catalogue, by adding the types of designations that are considered insufficient to deem an occasional group or event being formally named as a corporate body.

This relates also to the choice of heading: if the name does not exist, the corporate body itself does not exist, and cannot have a heading. It is not a modification of - or an addition to - the *Statement of Principles*, but a useful explanation of a text, which as it stands is not ambiguous, but it is too weak not to leave space for misunderstandings (e.g. see recommendation 2).

There is still an unsolved issue: the sections on religious bodies (nos. 29-34) are provisional, because there was no agreement on them in the WG. Some members felt that all religious bodies should be entered:

- a. as subheadings;
- b. under their own names; or
- c. under the territorial name.

The help of an expert, Thomas Pater, and the re-examination by the WG, led to a definitive text, and to the approval (at the 1982 IFLA Conference in Montreal) of paragraphs 29-34, which were printed on a loose-leaf sheet to be added to the original text, and published in the first issue of *International Cataloguing* in 1983.

¹⁵ Cf. IFLA Working Group on Corporate Headings, London, 26-28 April. – In: *International cataloguing*, vol. 6, no. 3 (1977), p. 26.

In 1989 IFLA set up a Review Group on FSCH, chaired by Nicole Simon, which sent an enquiry to Standing Committee members, European national libraries and the Library of Congress, with a proposal from Marion Mouchot advocating a change of treatment for abbreviations. ‘A report synthesising the responses was submitted to a special review group which met in Stockholm in 1991 and which also considered the question whether geographic qualifiers should be systematic or not. It was agreed to transcribe abbreviated forms without dots and without spaces, irrespective of whether the form of name used in the publication is an initialism or an acronym. The discussion on the use of geographic qualifiers led to the conclusion that addition was found necessary only whenever it is desirable for distinguishing between homonymous names’.¹⁶ The Review Group consulted experts in various countries (seven in Europe and one in the USA), and finally proposed two modifications to the document, on abbreviated forms and geographic qualifiers, which were approved at the 1992 IFLA Conference in Moscow.

Structures of Corporate Name Headings (SCNH)¹⁷

The Review Group on FSCH also discussed the need for a general review of the standard. In his response to the Review Group in 1990, referring to Frans Heymans’s study,¹⁸ Ton Heijligers expressed the view that in bibliographic practice the FSCH rules were found to be rather complicated and labour-intensive, and that they did not result in the desired uniformity. He further developed Heymans’s idea for corporate names by making a distinction between a heading’s *universal control form* to be used for exchange purposes and a *uniform heading* for (national) catalogues. The Standing Committee on Cataloguing concluded that it did not seem necessary for Verona’s work to be revised significantly.¹⁹

In 1995, the Section on Cataloguing became more and more aware that, in spite of FSCH, bibliographic practice did not yet show much uniformity in the treatment of corporate name headings. The Section established a new Working Group on FSCH (initially chaired by Barbara Tillett, and then from 1997 onwards by Ton Heijligers), and assigned to it the task of examining the 1980 standard in order to see how it should be revised. The discussions soon concentrated on the presumed *functions of FSCH*. The question was: can one standard serve two purposes at the same time?

1. To facilitate the online exchange of corporate names by offering guidelines for the creation of what might be called *universal control forms* per body (preferably linked to an international number); to clearly identify each corporate body and distinguish it from others (including variant names); and to communicate which form is chosen for the uniform heading in the country of origin of the body.
2. To be a useful guide for setting up international rules for the establishment of a universally accepted *uniform heading*, in spite of the fact that within a country uniform headings are (in terms of form, language, word order, etc.) often moulded according to national needs and traditions.

At the 1996 Beijing IFLA Conference, it was concluded that an international set of rules that would be accepted by everyone was probably not possible, but that FSCH might be useful in suggesting a structure for corporate headings in library catalogues. At the same time, it was thought desirable for

¹⁶ Ibidem.

¹⁷ This part is taken from the introduction to SCNH, with abridgments and amendments.

¹⁸ ‘How humanusable is interchangeable? Or, shall we produce catalogues or babelgraphic towers?’ / Frans Heymans. – In: *Library resources & technical services*. – Vol. 26, no. 2 (Apr./June 1982), p. 157-169.

¹⁹ *Review Group on ‘Form and Structure of Corporate Headings’* / IFLA Standing Committee on Cataloguing. – In: *International Cataloguing & Bibliographic Control*. – Vol. 21, no. 4 (Oct./Dec. 1992), p. 53.

the National Bibliographic Agencies (NBA) to follow similar rules, but that it was not essential to have identical name forms, because of new opportunities offered by the emergence of computer-assisted techniques. Yet, it was also considered important to use forms that were familiar and would be understood by the user.

The Working Group members agreed to focus on reviewing the current text of FSCH, and identified ten subjects (areas and rules) to be considered for revision, the so-called *Beijing Assignments*.

In an attempt to bring into line differing opinions on the functions that should be assigned to FSCH, a discussion paper ‘How to proceed with the FSCH revision?’ was distributed in June 1997, with an appendix containing a text model for the revision of rules 1-24. The responses, which were discussed at the 1997 Copenhagen Conference, led to the conclusion that there was still much uncertainty about which direction to take, and that, as a consequence, it would have been better to have started the revision after the results of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN, and the revision activities in regard to AACR and RAK, had become available.

It was also agreed that at least *guiding principles* should be elaborated before rules could be prescribed, and to save time, it was decided to hire a consultant for whom the following principles and statements were prepared:

- the user as primary focus
- the economic advantage of a shared standard, but also recognition of national conventions
- the need for a logical set of rules
- the use of the form of a corporate name as found, unless there was a good reason for change that could be readily explained
- the impossibility of ignoring past practice.

On this basis the Working Group identified the rules for qualifiers and omissions (FSCH rules 713,23) as the most problematical. Rule 6, concerning the effects of change of place, also had to be looked at more accurately. An overall picture of the most important differences between national practices would be required to test the different options against the already agreed upon statements and leading principles. The consultant should formulate a set of rule principles on the basis of the results of the rule comparisons.

Then the comparison of rules was begun, examining the differences between examples from the German RAK, the LOC database, the Russian rules, AACR2, the FSCH rules and the Italian RICA. General remarks about a revision of the rules for qualifiers were received from Germany and Italy. In the spring of 1998 doubts arose about whether to continue the work.

During the comparison work, it became more and more clear that the emphasis should be shifted from the *content* of headings to main principles and a common *structure* for headings.

After 40 years it became clear that elimination of differences of opinion could not be expected: the *Paris Principles* and the FSCH rules have always been deviated from as soon as a national bibliographic agency considered it necessary in order to be able to meet its country’s national needs. During the Amsterdam 1998 IFLA Conference, the FSCH Working Group explicitly concluded that requiring the whole world to use the same form of (uniform) heading was not a feasible option; it was decided that the revision of the FSCH rules was no longer considered a priority; and a set of *Recommendations* was presented:

- the WG embraced the views as put forward in the 1998 report of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN.²⁰ (i.e. to allow National Bibliographic Agencies to preserve differences in authorised forms that best meet the language and cultural needs of their countries)
- the WG on FSCH also recognised the need 1: to match authority records for the same entity; 2: to use numbers for each entity; and 3: to compile a set of principles and basic guidelines for corporate headings as an indispensable tool for cataloguers.

The fact that international unification of the intellectual content of corporate headings was no longer considered necessary did not altogether eliminate the need for international cataloguing rules. Their first purpose with regard to corporate headings will now be to facilitate international exchange of corporate names (even when they are not identical), whether this is from the perspective of joint input into one international authority file, or from the perspective of multi-file searching across a range of (national) authority files in different countries. This new angle threw another light on the kind of guidelines to be constructed, and thus on the preparatory tasks for the working group itself and for its consultant.

It was therefore decided that the FSCH Working Group should collect examples from the countries represented by the members of the Section on Cataloguing. The survey resulting from this *FSCH exercise* should reveal all the practical variations in name forms, and should thereby help formulate the specific requirements for a computer format, or for computer systems to be flexible enough to accommodate all kinds of corporate name headings from any source worldwide. This also meant that, in some way, all countries would be encouraged to conform to forms and structures that would more easily be processed by computers – in order to take full advantage of other international links for the sake of their users. It had also come to mind that as yet there were no guidelines for non-roman scripts, and that there might be a wish to develop these.

At the 1998 Amsterdam Conference a detailed discussion did not take place, but the suggestion was advanced that all details dealing with name structure should be made visible, and that it would be difficult to foresee which findings would ultimately be relevant for automated processing. In the meantime, it was safe to expect that particular form patterns would emerge from the enquiry, and it was thought that it might assist the usefulness of the final survey if the patterns were given a place in the model. These considerations resulted in the introduction of forms of name categories and further form specifications. The contributors were requested to list each example of a corporate name heading under one of eight categories. Further form specifications were added to enable the contributors to give information on particular elements used in the name headings, especially types of additions (qualifiers).

The collocation of names pertaining to the same corporate body (with an indication of the authorisation result per country) is still considered to be an important facility for the user, and a condition for the efficient exchange of name information on corporate bodies. In order to examine potential problems connected with the realisation of collocation more accurately, the contributors (with the input of the other Section on Cataloguing members) were asked to indicate the catalogue functions of the headings (authorised form or variant name), and indicate when references were being made from variant forms to the authorised form, and/or vice versa. This survey produced results that reflect bibliographic practice in fourteen countries.

Once a pilot by a few contributors had been tested, it was necessary for the sake of consistency to stick to the system through all the stages of the exercise. On the other hand, whatever system had been devised, there would always have been categories open to discussion. Though the first aim of the survey was to provide facts about structures and punctuation patterns, an extra column 7 with

²⁰ *Mandatory data elements for internationally shared resource authority records / report of the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Minimal Level Authority Records and ISADN.* – Frankfurt am Main: IFLA UBCIM Programme, 1998. Also available online on IFLANET: <<http://www.ifla.org/VI/3/p1996-2/mlar.htm>>.

some information on the application of certain *FSCH* rules has been added by the compiler, in order to offer some insight into the application of relevant *FSCH* rules in various countries, and to help increased understanding of differences in name structures.

In August 2000 at the Jerusalem Conference meeting of the Working Group on *FSCH*, there were two items on the agenda: a discussion on the report of the survey, and recommendations on a follow-up to the inquiry. Representatives from FRANAR joined the meeting to discuss points of mutual interest, and suggested further steps regarding corporate names and headings. It was reconfirmed that the main goal was to facilitate the adequate listing of corporate names in a virtual database for authority records, and to inform system developers about what was to be expected from the form and structure of corporate names as they are reflected in the current cataloguing practices of fourteen countries.

The Group agreed that any solution regarding corporate names depended on decisions that included making links between headings and the use of international numbers, such as those being considered in FRANAR. This is where the *FSCH* and FRANAR Working Groups found themselves on common ground, and why FRANAR was asked to study the survey closely, to take its findings into account in its subsequent activities, and to inform the Permanent UNIMARC Committee of requirements for UNIMARC/Authorities, if necessary.

The author of the report went through the draft text accepting corrections and suggestions from the Working Group on *FSCH*, in order to finalise it and have it prepared for publication. At its second Jerusalem meeting, the Standing Committee on Cataloguing supported the position taken by the Working Group, concluded that the survey had fulfilled the task given to the Working Group, and agreed to organise the follow-up process as expected.

*In the field of Archives*²¹

International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families
ISAAR (CPF) – 2002²²

ISAAR (CPF), *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families*, is mainly a tool for the authority control of the names of creators of archives; a tool to standardize what in the new edition is defined as the ‘authorised form of name’. ISAAR(CPF), as an international standard, does not define any specific rule for the creation of the ‘authorised form of names’: it simply refers to national rules, to national and international conventions and points to the general processes supervising their creation.²³ The single national agencies will only have to adopt ‘codes’ of rules on the subject already in existence (first of all, the rules on author cataloguing in libraries), or to create them *ex novo*, obviously with an eye to well-established experience in related subject fields. Clearly, as a tool to optimize access and searching in archival description systems, the model offered by ISAAR (CPF) has remarkable similarities and concurrences with the authority control of authors’ names in library catalogues. The differentiating elements start with the chief

²¹ Cf. Stefano Vitali, ‘The second edition of ISAAR(CPF) and authority control in systems for archival description archival descriptive systems’. Paper presented at the International Conference on Authority Control, Florence, Italy, February 10-12, 2003; www.unifi.it/biblioteche/ac.

²² First edition: Ottawa: CIA, 1994.

²³ “Record the standardized form of name for the entity being described in accordance with any relevant national or international conventions or rules applied by the agency that created the authority record. Use dates, place, jurisdiction, occupation, epithet and other qualifiers as appropriate to distinguish the authorized form of name from those of other entities with similar names. Specify separately in the Rules and/or conventions element (5.5.3) which rules have been applied for this element” (5.1.2).

aspects that the authority records for creating entities take in archival description systems, because of the basic role given to the context of production within the archival description (1.8).

The first aspect of theoretical relevance, implied in the whole framework of the second edition of ISAAR (CPF), is certainly the greater emphasis on its features as a tool for managing the description of entities, rather than for establishing authority names. The aim in the second edition of ISAAR (CPF) is to describe those entities (institutions, corporate bodies in general, persons and families) that happen to be creators of archives, and form the context of archival material. The formulation of the ‘authorised form of name’ is consequent on this objective, and aims first of all at unequivocally identifying those entities, rather than making unambiguous similar names as in the first edition of ISAAR. In short, the stress is on the thing (the real entity), rather than on the name of the thing (the authorised heading). This difference in the framework can be seen mostly in the way in which the issue of the relationships between different entities (that is, among the various creators) is approached in the new edition of the standard.

While in the first edition they were managed mainly as relationships among authority entries, by ‘see’ and ‘see also’ references, in the second edition there is a special section which presents the relationships of a given creator with other corporate bodies, persons, families,²⁴ indicating: name and identifier of the related entity (5.3.1); category of relationship (hierarchical, chronological, associative) (5.3.2); specific nature of the relationship and its description (5.3.3); and dates of relationship (5.3.4). In this attention to the relationships among different entities, we sense a desire to implement systems that are not limited to managing the sources/creators’ relationship but which, by putting the latter at the centre, can represent the complex links that exist among the various creators, links that can be important sources from which a researcher can get information on relevant search routes that can also be verified and followed inside archives and documents produced by the various creators. But we also sense something more in this model for managing relationships, that is, a desire to make it possible for archival systems ‘to get out of themselves’, as it were, in the direction of prefiguring the sharing of archival authority records in wider environments than the merely institutional ones, pointing out links between local and national archival systems, but also between archival systems and descriptive systems or cataloguing ones of a different nature. These connections might also take place by means of linking different entities that are described in specific authority records in diverse systems: for example, linking a political party, that is the creator of archival sources, to one of its leaders who, on the contrary, is the author of essays, lectures and so on, recorded in a library catalogue.

In addition, other component parts of the new ISAAR (CPF) seek to puncture what I have previously described as the self referential quality of archival systems, and to envisage the possibility of sharing and linking data and information with catalogues and descriptive systems outside the archival domain. The descriptive element 5. 1. 4. (‘Standardized forms of name according to other rules’), whose main aim is to record authorised forms of names constructed according to different rules from the ones followed by the archival institution compiling the authority record, points in this direction,²⁵ by, for example, giving an account of how the record for the same body can be represented according to AACR2. It offers the possibility of establishing authority records to which we can get access through archival descriptive systems by a given heading and which, at the same time, we can retrieve within search systems shared by archives and libraries by access to a heading that is created according to different rules. This is a point that it would be worth thinking about and discussing again, since it is a first limited step towards the

²⁴ ‘The purpose of this area is to describe relationships with other corporate bodies, persons and families. In the case of complex hierarchies or administrative changes, refer to national rules for guidance on when to create separate authority records. Where it is decided to describe such complexity in the context of a single authority record, record relevant information in the Internal structure element (5.2.7)’ (5.3).

²⁵ ‘To record standardized forms of name for the corporate body, person or family that have been constructed according to rules other than those applied by the agency that has created the authority record.’ (5.1.4)

design of systems that can talk to each other exactly because they share and exchange authority records.

Anyway, it must be stressed that there are other steps in the same direction in the new version of ISAAR (CPF). A section completely devoted to methods of linking authority records, archival descriptions and different information resources has been introduced. As stated in the brief introduction to Chapter 6 of the new edition of ISAAR (CPF): ‘Archival authority records are created primarily for the purpose of supporting the linking of descriptions of records creators to descriptions of the records they created. Archival authority records can also be linked to other relevant information resources that are related to the records creator. This Section provides guidance on how such linkages can be created in the context of an archival descriptive control system (6)’.

Paris heritage today

Apart from Eva Verona’s work, post-Paris international activity has ignored issues relating to the choice of main and added entries under the name of a corporate body, and has reduced its sphere of interest to the form and structure of headings, and later to structure only. The differences among the national rules deal with each of these points. The present initiative for an international cataloguing code must not renounce the objective of better agreements on the choice of entries and the form and structure of headings under the name of a corporate body.

To make this task easier an overview follows of the factors involved in the choice of entries and the fixing of the form of headings. The factors to be considered are: author, corporate body, alternative responsibility, work, formal marks of the edition (manifestation), access points, other organizing devices of the catalogue and international agreements.

A. Author

The author is the keystone of every bibliographic and cataloguing work in western culture, due to the special stress on individuals and their activities, and to the consequent close link between a work and its author established in our tradition.

1. Strictly, the author is the creator of the work (the writer of the text, the composer of a score, etc.).
2. For cataloguing purposes, the word ‘author’ has a wide scope, comprising the attribution of authorship
 - 2.1. by convention, arising out of the cultural and/or bibliographic tradition, and
 - 2.2. in the light of functionality, relying on the convenience of evidence, on the ‘knowability’ of formal presentation.

B. Corporate body

1. Name: having a name is a necessary condition for its identification and consideration. Determining if an occasional group or event has or has not a name is a question without clear boundaries.
2. A change of name causes the cessation of the corporate body under its previous name, and the existence of another corporate body with the subsequent name. Minimal changes that are to be considered irrelevant should be clearly determined clearly, but the boundary line should break a continuum of barely perceptible variations.

3. Different types of corporate bodies may be distinct: societies, institutions, territorial authorities, religious bodies, commercial publishers, etc. These distinctions are irrelevant to the choice of the entry.
4. Some corporate bodies are recognized to be subordinate to a superior body. This fact is relevant only in relation to the form and structure of the heading.
5. Two kinds of corporate bodies may be distinguished: permanent bodies and occasional groups and events.
6. Occasional groups and events may be subordinate to a superior body.

C. Corporate authorship. For the concept and application of corporate authorship, first of all, the two named factors and their variables should be confronted.

1. Strictly a corporate body may not be called the author of a work, unless
 - 1.1. its members have actually created the work in a collective manner (e.g. a working group whose, say, five members draft, discuss, write, correct, and edit a paper together; or the proceedings of a conference, that is, an aggregate work resulting from the collective contributions of the lecturers speaking at the conference); for linguistic and conceptual reasons, the term 'Urheber', ('originator') has been introduced, instead of author.
2. For cataloguing purposes the same extension as for personal authors may be adopted, that is, a corporate body may be the author (originator) of a work:
 - 2.1. by convention, arising out of the cultural and/or bibliographic tradition (cf. the parallel archival disposition to attribute documents to the corporate bodies from which they emanate), and
 - 2.2. in the light of functionality, relying on the convenience of evidence, on the 'knowability' of formal presentation that shows corporate bodies in the same position and style as personal authors.

Within these broad general conditions, corporate authorship is possible; for its actual application to a work, the following factors should be taken into account.

D. Alternative responsibility.

Other bibliographic entities may represent an alternative to the main entry under the name of a corporate body:

1. Personal authorship in works commissioned, edited or issued by a corporate body (the alternative may be also the authorship of another body or of a subordinate body, instead of that of a person).
2. Dignitaries producing works in their official capacity.
3. Other corporate bodies acting as co-authors (co-originators).

In the first and second instances, corporate authorship in a strict sense is excluded.

The third instance should be treated in the same way as personal multiple authorship, provided that other conditions apply.

E. Work.

Distinctions affecting the choice of main entry have been made among different types of works:

1. Works of an administrative character, which by their nature are necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body,
2. Works of an intellectual character dealing with scientific, technical, economic, etc. topics.

This main distinction, which is based on the nature and content of the work, separates works for which no other author can be considered or identified other than the corporate body, from those that are subject to conditions before being entered under the name of a corporate body.

Other types of works have been considered, particularly:

3. Constitutions, charters, laws, decrees, treaties, budgets: they are conventionally entered under the name of the territorial authority.
4. Liturgical works: they should be reduced to general rules, but problems arise related to the difficulty of determining their origins, nature and typology.
5. Serials: they are entered under title by convention, setting aside the issue of main entry under the name of a corporate body, but the latter returns to the equation if the title proper consists of a generic term.

Allowing for the development of cataloguing after Paris, the following types should also be specifically considered:

6. Non-textual and multimedia works
7. Remote access resources
8. Non-static resources

They require more extensive study to investigate their deep differences in comparison to traditional textual works: differences in the loss of individuality in the creative act; in lacking consolidated frames for the presentation of formal marks; in multiplicity and variability of contents and forms; and in perception and approach by the users, so that both narrower and broader denotations of author (see above Author, A.1 and A.2) are taken into serious discussion.

F. Formal marks of the edition (manifestation)

The relation of authorship linking a corporate body to a work is mediated by the edition of the work, where its physical marks are the first manifestation and witness to the role of the corporate body. The presentation of the title-page is one side of the polarized tension between literary unit and bibliographical unit. From an examination of the formal marks we may find:

1. Formal evidence of the name of the corporate body on the title-page (or title-page substitute)
2. Corporate body presented as the publisher or as fulfilling other functions
3. No formal evidence of the name of the corporate body
4. Formal evidence of alternative responsibilities.

The combined correlation of the type of work, the presence of formal marks, and of alternative responsibility supplies the conditions for actually choosing the access points.

G. Access points under the name of a corporate body (the following solutions are only indicative of the prevailing trends in the Paris Principles and national rules, and depend on present or future international agreement):

1. Main entry: it should be restricted to clearly specified conditions, such as works of an administrative character ($E = 1$); constitutions, charters, laws, etc. ($E = 3$); works of an intellectual character ($E = 2$), provided that the work has been actually created in a collective manner ($C = 1.1$), provided that there is no alternative responsibility ($D = 0$), and provided that the name of the corporate body appear in formal evidence on the title-page ($F = 1$).
2. Added entries: they should be enlarged to every case corresponding to $C = 2.1$ or 2.2

3. References: they should be made if a corporate body has changed name ($B = 2$), and from variant forms of the name to the uniform heading
4. No entry: if the corporate body has no name ($B = 1$), or if none of the preceding conditions is fulfilled.

H. Other organizing devices of the catalogue are considered for the complete fulfilment of its functions:

1. Uniform titles: they should be adopted to collocate editions of the same work; no particular matter for corporate authorship.
2. Formal subheadings: they have been proposed to collect works of the same form under the name of territorial authorities; ‘a discordant anachronism’, in Lubetzky’s opinion.
3. Chronological subheadings: they have been adopted under the name of organs of territorial authorities, with the succession of the names of the persons holding the office; a complex classifying method, mixing heterogeneous elements without correspondence with the stated functions of the catalogue.
4. Added entries: they should be provided also for all the bodies collectively responsible for the realization of a particular expression of a work (e.g. for the performance of Beethoven’s Opus 59 (string quartets), an entry under the name Quartetto italiano, not four entries under the names of individual artists Paolo Borciani, Elisa Pegreffi, Piero Farulli and Franco Rossi).

I. International agreement

The scheme of interpretation of corporate authorship, and the proposed solutions for the choice of main and added entries, are aimed at making the Paris Principles explicit, and summarizing the controversial points in cataloguing rules: they may be assumed for further investigation, and as a basis for pursuing an international agreement. Each of the preceding elements should be marked as corresponding or not corresponding to, as progressive or regressive, compared with:

1. Paris Principles established by the ICCP
2. Rules in post-Paris codes
3. Practice in national bibliographic agencies

In this comparison the conditions of cataloguing in 1961 should not be forgotten: the use of the card catalogue and the alphabetical sequence as the only possible source for research, the role of the main entry, the only full entry. As far as local rules are concerned, historical, cultural and linguistic peculiarities should be considered, but not every tradition should be preserved absolutely, if it obstructs worldwide agreements.

Form and structure of uniform headings

Recent progress in authority control and the study for a Virtual International Authority File have reduced the need for internationally shared uniform headings. Nevertheless, the need to agree on the form and structure of authorized access points remains, in order to facilitate the comprehensibility and the exchange of data. The survey of structures of names adopted nowadays (see above, SCNH) is an important step, requiring further investigation and decisions, defining the more consistent and convenient structures, in order to share them fluently.

Some elements named above are not considered for the choice of entries, but are important in determining the form and structure of headings: the type of corporate body (territorial authorities and religious bodies), subordinate bodies, formal and chronological subheadings, temporary bodies, and other elements of analysis, such as the distinction between organs or non-organs of territorial authorities.

Among the many themes discussed, the most controversial ones may be cited: the choice between forms in the original or local language, or between variants in different languages, between direct or subordinate forms of the name or geographical name (e.g. for dioceses), the use of qualifiers, of acronyms, the omission of elements from the name, not to mention the difficulty of identifying the most frequently used name in the publications of a corporate body.

Appendix, from Form and Structure of Corporate Headings

0.2 Definitions

Definitions for terms are given in the sense in which they are used in these recommendations.

Conference: A generic term for an occasional group used to cover congresses, symposia, meetings, diplomatic conferences, festivals, fairs, exhibitions, expeditions, etc.

Corporate body: Any organization or group of persons and/or organizations which is identified by a particular name. This includes named occasional groups and events, such as meetings, conferences, congresses, expeditions, exhibitions, festivals, and fairs.

Non-organ (of a territorial authority): A corporate body that is created or controlled by a territorial authority, exercising educational, scientific, technical, cultural, medical, religious, social, commercial, or industrial functions. This includes schools, universities, libraries, theatres, museums, hospitals, churches, and banks, so created or controlled.

Organ (of a territorial authority): A corporate body that is created or controlled by a territorial authority, exercising legislative, judicial, administrative, informational, military, or diplomatic functions. This includes parliaments, ministries, courts, information offices, units of the armed forces, and embassies.

Qualifier: A term added to a corporate name in order to supply additional information as an aid in identification. This includes geographic names, dates, type of body, or other characterizing words or phrases.

Subordinate body: A corporate body established, administered, or controlled by another corporate body.

Territorial authority: A corporate body that exercises government functions (full or restricted) over a certain territory, or claims to exercise them. This includes states, constituent states and federal units, and their regional or local units.

Uniform heading: A heading established in a form to be followed without variation whenever the heading appears in a bibliographic record.

References

A historical approach to corporate entries / Eva Verona. – p. 1-40. – In: Libri, vol. 7 (1957).

Report / International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, 9th-18th October, 1961; [edited by A. H. Chaplin and Dorothy Anderson]. – London: International Federation of Library Associations, 1963. – Working papers of the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles: No. 1: Relation between cataloguing principles and principles applicable to other forms of bibliographic works / by Andrew D. Osborn: p. 125-137 – No. 2: The function of main entry in the alphabetical catalogue : one approach / by Seymour Lubetzky: p. 139-143 – No. 3: The function of the main entry in the alphabetical catalogue : a second approach / Eva Verona: p. 145-157 – No. 4: The function of the main entry in the alphabetical catalogue : a study of the views put forward by Lubetzky and Verona / by Leonard J. Jolley: p. 159-163 – No. 5: 1, Limits to the use of entries under corporate authors ; 2, The cataloguing of laws and treaties / by V. A. Vasilevskaya: p. 165-174 – No. 6: Corporate authorship. 1, Form of heading for corporate authors. 2, Treatment of subordinate bodies / by Suzanne Honoré: p. 175-183 – No. 7: Entry of anonymous works under standard or form titles / by Roger Pierrot: p. 185-190 – No. 8: Problems in the cataloguing of serial publications / by Paul S. Dunkin: p. 191-198. No. 9: Cataloguing of liturgies and religious texts in the alphabetical catalogue / by Ruth C. Eisenhart: p. 199-206 – No. 10: Multiple authorship / by Hellmut Braun: p. 207-218 – No. 11: Choice of entry for authors whose names vary / Pavle Kalan: p. 219-227 – No. 12: Compound surnames and surnames with prefixes / by Fernanda Ascarelli: p. 229-241 – No. 13: Treatment of Brazilian and Portuguese names / by Maria Luisa Monteiro da Cunha: p. 243-254 – No. 14: Rendering of Indic names-of-person in catalogue entries / by Benoyendra Sengupta: p. 255-265 – No. 15: Treatment of arabic names / by Mahmud Sheniti: p. 267-276 – No. 16: The treatment of names in Hebrew characters and title entry for hebrew books / by R. Edelmann: p. 277-279 – No. 17: The impact of electronics upon cataloguing rules / by C. D. Gull: p. 281-290. – Reprinted: London: Clive Bingley, 1969; IFLA International Office for UBC, 1981.

Statement of principles adopted by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961. – Annotated ed. / with commentary and examples by A.H. Chaplin, assisted by Dorothy Anderson. -- Provisional ed. – Sevenoaks : distributed by IFLA Secretariat, 1966.

Statement of principles adopted at the international Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October, 1961. – Annotated ed. / with commentary and examples by Eva Verona, assisted by Franz Georg Kaltwasser, P.R. Lewis, Roger Pierrot. – London: IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971.

Corporate headings: their use in library catalogues and national bibliographies: a comparative and critical study / by Eva Verona. – London: IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1975.

Functions and objects of author and title cataloguing: a contribution to cataloguing theory / by Ákos Domanovszky ; English text edited by Anthony Thomson. – München : Verlag Dokumentation, 1975.

Form and structure of corporate headings / recommendations of the Working Group on Corporate Headings; approved by the Standing Committee of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing and the IFLA Section on Official Publications. – London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1980.

Corporate authorship: its role in library cataloging / Michael Carpenter. – Wesport, Conn. ; London : Greenwood Press, 1981.

La catalogazione dopo Parigi : attività normative e strumenti per il controllo bibliografico universale, 1961-1997 / Pino Buizza. – Udine : Forum, 1998.

Review Group on ‘Form and Structure of Corporate Headings’ /IFLA Standing Committee on Cataloguing. – p. 53. -- In: International cataloguing & bibliographic control. – Vol. 21, no. 4 (Oct./Dec. 1992).