

other information regarding his meetings with other personalities, his illness and death. A number of 1181 articles (criticism) in periodicals prove that Eminescu was not only accepted in Transylvania, but he also compelled recognition as the greatest Romanian poet.

His work had a great influence on Transylvanians. Besides the linguistic revolution Eminescu initiated a real aesthetic revolution, influencing the style of local writers. His work opened a large thematic universe, nourishing their imagination and creative thinking.

We do not pretend that this bibliography is exhaustive: we had limited our research to the collections of the Central University Library in Cluj. Nevertheless, this does not diminish the importance and value of the authors' objectives and accomplishment.

READING THE WORK OF VALERIA NISTOR AND MARIA MICLE

Nastasia FODOREAN
Head, Cataloguing-Classification Department,
Central University Library, Cluj

The thought of writing this paper occurred when I first read the work of our colleagues Valeria Nistor and Maria Micle from the "Eugen Todoran" Central University Library, Timișoara, entitled *Normele ISBD(M) și ISBD(S) în modele și exerciții - ISBD(M) and ISBD(S) Norms. Models and Exercises*, published by Editura Universității de Vest din Timișoara in 2002. This is the first work in Romania which offers a comparative view of the two international norms: the authors present differences and similarities in a separate chapter.¹ Moreover, this is one of the few

¹ Chapter IV. *The Description of Monographs and Serials. Similarities and Differences*

works dealing with the issue of cataloguing periodicals which is quite difficult especially for beginners. We must recognize that there are still many libraries in the country where the cataloguing of periodicals is neglected. Therefore the work of our colleagues from Timișoara proves to be useful and interesting at the same time.

The material is logically structured, starting with the general issues of the standard international description of publications (Chapter I) followed by chapters presenting the ISBD(M) and ISBD(S) norms.

The last chapter is the most interesting and it was probably the basic idea of the work: there are some ingenious exercises of testing the knowledge of cataloguers, those who practice the job for a long time now and those who are learning it. As the Preface says, the work is written for librarians but also students, mainly students from Timișoara. I am going to use these exercises at the Cataloguing seminars of the Librarianship Department of Cluj University. We also have a seminar workbook with other types of cataloguing exercises and questionnaires.¹

All fields are presented for monographs and periodicals as well and there are also observations rooted in the everyday practice of cataloguing, referring to difficulties most frequently encountered by the cataloguer.

I do not intend to make completions or give suggestions for a future edition of this work but try to highlight some aspects of cataloguing which have not been treated in depth by the special literature. Not even the Stas 12629/2-88 offered answer to certain questions arising in the process of cataloguing, a profession that I have practised for 30 years now.

I would like to present some unwritten rules of cataloguing discussed with my colleagues in university and school libraries. These rules have already been adopted in our library. I do not mean to point out insufficiencies in the work of our colleagues

¹ Fodoeran, Nastasia, ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description (For Monographs). Caiet de seminar, UBB Cluj, Cluj, 1996.

from Timișoara, rather, I would like to make suggestions for a national code of cataloguing.

The authors present the same rules of cataloguing as those used by the Central University Library, Cluj which is all the more promising as there are slight differences in the application of ISBD norms in the various libraries, depending on their traditions and conservatism.

I will present my observations and suggestions in the order followed by the authors in treating the cataloguing of monographs because my observations refer to this type of documents.

Before discussing each field, I will enumerate the main types of documents the cataloguing of which is more difficult. We will not deal with rules of classification as they are already known.

- *Bilingual dictionaries;*
- *Collections. Types of collections :*
- several papers of the same author, without a common title;
- several papers of the same author, with a common title several papers of the same author, without a common title, one of the works gives the title of the volume;
- several papers of different authors, without a common title;
- several papers of different authors, with a common title;
- several papers of different authors, without a common title, one of the works gives the title of the volume;
- separate papers linked together (composite volumes).¹

¹ There are authentic composite volumes and composite volumes created by the caprice of the collector who gathers several works by different authors under the same cover, to have easy access to a certain subject. Every work has its own title page and different years of publication. I do not agree that in the case of new publications the composite volume should be separated into two or more individual volumes and the single volume replaced by two or more volumes. From the point of view of cataloguing, every single volume must have its own catalogue card and

- *The cycle which a work belongs to;*
- *Congresses, symposiums, conferences, etc.;*
- *Extracts from serials;*
- *Facsimiles;*
- *A work which has as its title a personal name;*
- *Correspondence (sent and received);*
- *Laws, decrees, codes.*

I will deal with those fields only which proved to be problematic from the point of view of cataloguing. Regarding the field of the title and informations about the title, I would like to mention *English titles*. It is well-known that editors of English books (published in England, America or any other country) often spell all the words in the title with capital letters sometimes with the exception of link words. Moreover, this is also practiced by publishers of Romanian books. Anglo-American rules of cataloguing deal with the question of using capital letters in titles: "Transcribe the title proper exactly as to wording, order and spelling, but *not necessarily as to punctuation and capitalization*".¹ It can be seen therefore that not even the English or the Americans capitalize titles. However, several on-line catalogues avoid this advice. I think it is high time to reach an agreement in this question.

Similarly, the authors (Nistor and Micle) and the speciality literature recommend that *informations about the title be written with small letters*. However, this rule is not followed by all libraries in our country. The rule is clearly formulated in this case even though we do not think it is correct in all the cases. We must not forget that the ISBD punctuation has nothing in common with grammatical punctuation or the punctuation that the librarian would like to use. ISBD punctuation seems sometimes forced or unnatural.

there must also be a "mother" type collective card containing all the titles.

¹ *Anglo-American cataloguing rules*. Ed. by Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler, Chicago, American Library Association; Ottawa, Canadian Library Association, 1978, p.12. My italics.

Let us continue with the field of Edition. The notion of “edition” can also be confusing. “Edition” means:

1. the total number of copies of a document produced starting from the same typographic composition or the same copy;
2. copies of an edition which only differ in physical features or the material used for the recording of the contents¹ or;
3. “New edition – edition which contains important changes as compared to previous editions”²

“The edition of a document consists of a set of printed or reproduced copies starting from the same original and edited by an editor or a group of editors. A new edition is one which differs from the others on account of modifications in the content, language, material or format.”³

In our country publishers often use the word “*edition*” as a synonym of “work”. In this case we do not have a new edition of a work and the investigations for previous editions would make the work of the librarian more difficult. We suggest the use of the field of edition in these cases too, instead of the insertion of the information as a note in the field of the title. In other words, *simplifying*, whenever the word “*edition*” appears on the publication, in the language of the title itself, this should be inscribed in the field of edition even if the term is incorrectly used or confusing. In this way we could standardise cataloguing in the country.

In connection with the field of the data of publication the authors (Nistor and Micle) say: “if the data of publication cannot be identified from the main sources, complementary or secondary sources, the notations [that we already know] should be introduced”⁴. In automated systems, whenever the place of publi-

¹ Regneală, Mircea, *Vocabular de biblioteconomie și știința informării*, vol. 1, București, ABIR, 1995, p.111.

² Idem, p.114.

³ *Metodologia de aplicare a normelor ISBD (M)*, București, Biblioteca Centrală Universitară, 1993, p.39.

⁴ Nistor, Valeria, Micle, Maria, *Normele ISBD(M) și ISBD(S) în modele și exerciții*, Timișoara, Editura Universității de Vest, 2002, p.24.

cation for a certain publishing house is unknown (does not appear on the document) but appears in a database and the publisher is identified from the first two segments of the ISBN, we consider the database in question as a secondary source. I have come across databases in which the same publisher appeared in two fields, the place of publication and [S.I.] which made the retrieval of the document impossible.

Let us think about the use of the term “*publisher*” when it appears on the publication. In an automated catalogue it is important to have only one point of access for a publisher. In certain cases the word “Publishing House” is used in connection with the name itself, in other cases it is not used. I suggest the following rules, in conformity with the cataloguing practice in the Central University Library, Cluj and the practice of famous libraries in the world:

The word “Publishing House” should be included in the traditional or automated record in the following cases:

1. When the word or words following the word “*Publishing House*” (be it in Romanian or a foreign language, in the language of the title, in fact) correspond in gender, number and case to the word “*Publishing House*” or they form a set phrase (e.g. Editura Tehnică, Edition de Fallois, Verlag de Munter). This holds good for cases when the word “*Publishing House*” is at the end of the syntagm (Technische Verlag, Deutscher Instituts Verlag, Luso-Espanola de Ediciones).

2. When the publishing house bears the name of a famous person, the founder or the owner (Editura Eminescu, Verlag Peter Lang)¹

3. When the name of the publishing house is a geographic name in use (Editura Moldova)

¹ I do not think that we should eliminate the word “Publishing House” when the name of the publishing house is well-known or bears a personal name. A publishing house may be well-known in a country and unknown in another.

4. When the name of the publishing house consists of a numeral or a sigle (Editura 1F, Editura Trei, Editura AMM, Editura A'92)

The word "Publishing House" should not be included in the following cases:

1. When the publishing house has a self-sufficient name (Facla, Regnery, Wategay)

2. When the publishing house bears the name of a goddess or mythologic person (Venus, Apollo)

3. When the name of the publishing house is a first name (Anastasia). This rule is debatable.

4. When the publishing house bears a geographical name not used today (Dacia).

Note: The name of the publishing house must be written according to the orthography of the text. In case of recent Romanian publications the name of the publishing house must be written with capital letters, according to the rules of the most recent Dictionary of Orthography and Punctuation of the Romanian Language.

This note is important because many cataloguers do not take into account the orthographic rules of the text in case of recent publications, not even those in Romanian.

Expressions such as SRL, SA, Ltd, Gmbh must be eliminated from the name of the publishing house; these refer to the commercial organisational form of the publishing house. The publisher is a search field in automated systems therefore it is important to record its name in the same way every time. This is why I plead for respecting the above rules.

The use of the expression [s.a.] recommended by the state standard in question when the year of publication is unknown, is not sufficiently detailed. It is stated that the expression *sine anno* should be used in square paranthesis [s.a.] when not even the century is known. My opinion is that we cannot use this expression in the case of new publications. The cataloguer should state the approximate year of publication or at least the century. In the case

of old books a careful examination is necessary and we should ask the opinion of specialists in order to state an approximate date.

I suggest the use of the expression [*s.a.*] only in exceptional cases when the cataloguer cannot state the century at least when the document was published.

The observations at the end of the Field of quantitative description clearly expose the rule that the paging of a monograph also contains the colophon. How do we proceed when the colophon is preceded by advertisements and reading lists? Some cataloguers stick to the rule, others do not count the pages with advertisements, reading lists and the colophon. Who is right? We should standardise cataloguing from this point of view, too, as this is a frequent case in the practice of cataloguing. What shall we do when the typographic... is at the beginning of the publication, on the back of the title page? In fact, this is easier. We will count the last page of the text even if it is not numbered.

Regarding the use of a dot after the word “*cm*” when registering the format of a publication, we should make it clear that the word “*cm*” is an abbreviation in mathematics (the same as *m*, *kg*, *km*, *mm*) and should not be followed by a dot. In the case of cataloguing

- the dot after “*cm*” marks a new field (the series) which must be recorded after the dimensions of the document

- when the new field begins at the second vertical line, usually the field of notes and ISBN, the rule obliges us to use a dot at the end of the previous field and if this ends with the word *cm* we will have a dot after it which does not mark an abbreviation

- if the description ends with the word “*cm*” there is a dot after it which is a grammatical sign of closure

Exception: There is no dot after “cm” when there is an accompanying material introduced by the sign “+” or when the new field (series) begins in the next line, at the first vertical line

Besides the date and place of publication and the publisher, the fifth field, the field of the series should be discussed. Publishers are inconsistent in the use of name of series. Moreover,

if we would write all titles of series beginning with the word “series” or “collection”, the amount of information gathered after these words would be great and the user would have to read several records or cards to find the title in question.

Therefore we should state the cases in which we use the generic words *series*, *collection* or *library*. I will present some suggestions based on several national codes of cataloguing, on-line catalogues in Romanian and abroad and my own experiences. The title of a collection must be studied carefully, indifferently of the language of the publication and the words preceding the title proper should be eliminated even if we do not follow the bibliographic elements written on the document. I suggest that we avoid the use of the generic terms *series*, *collection* or *library* when the series has a self-sufficient title. The use of the terms *series*, *collection* or *library* is compulsory when they form a syntagm with the title.

The ISBD(M) says that very long titles of series may be abbreviated. I do not agree with this “advice” and recommend the use of the whole title, especially in a database.

Regarding the field of notes referring to doctorate theses, the theses written in Romania should have a more detailed note containing the name of the university, the faculty and the name of the supervisor. In case of a thesis written in other countries it is enough to give the name of the university and the mention “thesis”, without the name of the supervisor and the date of defending the thesis. In case of Romanian theses the date of defending can be found out from the summary which enters the library separately or does not enter the library at all. In our library doctorate theses are donations and their summaries enter the library through the Legal deposit, seldom together with the thesis itself.

These are the problems that I have been thinking about, trying to find solutions that would not come in contradiction with the ISBD rules.

Finally I would like to congratulate the authors for the rigorousness of the exercises presented and the work of collecting quite difficult models of cataloguing. They also included sample

title pages and presented the details necessary for compiling the descriptive notes near the title page.

The work of Valeria Nistor and Maria Micle is a reference work for future cataloguers and cataloguers who practice the profession for years and try to standardise this activity according to international rules.

The exceptional graphic quality and the low cost of the publication renders it all the more valuable.

VLADIMIR F. WERTSMAN (USA)

Vladimir F. Wertsman (born 6 April 1929) graduated from the faculty of Law of the “Al. I. Cuza” University, Iași (1953). He lives in the United States from 1967. He studied librarianship at the School of Library Science, Columbia University, New York (1968-1969). He was reference librarian at the Department of Science and Industry of Brooklyn Public Library, Brooklyn, New York (1969-1974) and assistant branch librarian at Canarsie Branch (1974-1977), Greenpoint Branch (1977-1980) and Leonard Branch (1980-1982), senior librarian at New York Public Library in New York and specialist of Slavonic and Romanian language at Foreign Library, Donnell Library Center (1982-1986).

He was senior librarian at the Learner’s Advisory Service and Job Information Center, Midmanhattan Library between 1987 and 1992, consultant of Harvard University in ethnic issues for the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (1980) and of the Study Center and Ethnic Publications of Kent State University (1978-1984). He has several publications, most of them in the field of the culture and civilisation of ethnic groups in the United States: *The Romanians in America. 1784-1974* (1975), *The Ukrainians in America. 1608-1975* (1976), *The Russians in America. 1727-1970* (1977), *The Armenians in America. 1618-1976* (1978), *The Romanians in America and Canada* (1980). He is member of the American Library Association from 1968 and President of the