

Choice of Author Access Points for Online Catalogs of Monographs in Spanish

Rafael Ruiz-Pérez

ABSTRACT. While standardization of headings has been treated extensively in many publications, the choice of access points for online catalogs has not been reviewed in depth in cataloguing rules. I propose a set of logical criteria for choosing author access points for monographs in Spanish; the proposed modifications are aimed at simplifying the Reglas de Catalogación Española (Spanish Cataloguing Rules), facilitating the decision process, and increasing the number of access points in computerized bibliographic records. Specifically, I suggest (1) abolishing the principles that underlie the rules for main entry headings and the rule of three, (2) eliminating a priori conditions for identifying authors of an item, (3) establishing a taxonomy of responsibility functions associated with an item, and (4) categorizing authors on the basis of their relevance for retrieval and for determining the number of access points. The proposed taxonomic key identifies twenty responsibility functions and classifies them into five categories of authors. *[Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-342-9678. E-mail address: getinfo@haworthpressinc.com]*

INTRODUCTION

Once an indispensable instrument for conventional cataloguing systems, the cataloguing rules have become one more tool among the

Rafael Ruiz-Pérez, PhD, is Professor, School of Library and Information, University of Granada, Granada, Spain.

Address correspondence to Rafael Ruiz-Pérez, Universidad de Granada, Departamento de Biblioteconomía y Documentación, Campus de Cartuja, 18071 Granada, Spain (r Ruiz@platon.ugr.es).

The author thanks Emilio Delgado López-Cózar for useful discussions, and Karen Shashok for translating the original manuscript into English.

many now available to facilitate standardization within the Integrated Library Management System. In the cataloguing and authority control module, the Rules in general fully regulate the choice of access points based on known elements, whereas for the establishment of uniform headings and the reference system, the rules are used only as a source of advice, along with the GARE, GSARE,¹ and other International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions rules and recommendations.

The diminishing influence of the Rules suggested that they would eventually become defunct: new retrieval technologies would provide all information available in a given catalogue with little concern for the criteria that the information should fulfill. However, it has become evident that computerization of bibliographic records has increased the need for standards.² The uniformity and consistency that authority control systems confer to catalogs are necessary in order to build and maintain bibliographic data bases. Cataloguing codes have thus become more, rather than less, important for computerized environments.

The efficacy of current standards now needs to be reviewed in view of technological advances that create new tasks and new demands for computerized catalog management. Some of the most important new challenges are to improve the standardization of storage formats and structures, simplify the format and content of records,^{3,4} and enhance the usefulness of authority files. Foremost among the new tasks is the development of storage and retrieval protocols that simplify computerization. This leads inevitably to questions regarding the usefulness of rules that were designed for manual cataloguing practices.

The need for reform is especially evident with regard to the choice of access points as information retrieval tools. In contrast with the attention given to the standardization of headings, the cataloguing rules for access points for bibliographic records have barely been modified to reflect the advent of automated cataloguing. However, some national rules have become more flexible,^{5,6} and research in the application of new procedures for computerized cataloguing has been forcing large libraries to take the initiative and develop their own solutions.

Since the early 1980s, important studies have examined the different standards involved in the production of bibliographic records, e.g., ISBDs, cataloguing rules and the MARC format. The cataloguing

codes are the rules that have been most directly affected by automation, and research has identified potential new criteria for determining access points and the process of choosing them. Conceptual and review studies dealing with standardization,⁷⁻¹⁰ studies that have proposed criteria based on common sense, frequency analyses of rule use,¹¹⁻¹³ and statistical and comparative analyses of access points in samples of records and collections,^{14,15} suggest two issues that need to be faced: (1) the irrelevance, for computerized cataloguing, of long-standing principles that underlie the rules now in use, and (2) the need to keep cataloguing procedures within the logical framework of decision-making and the empirical validity of the data.

The need for such tools was suggested in 1986 by Svenonius, Baughman and Molto.¹⁶ These authors studied a sample of English-language monographs to determine the distribution of access points in the sources of information, their presence or absence and actual use, and potential access points that were ignored. They identified five main responsibility functions: author, editor, emanator, illustrator and commercial editor. In addition, they distinguished between two main categories of author: the names of persons and bodies that make a significant contribution to the intellectual content of the work, and persons or bodies with no intellectual or creative function.

These earlier studies make it clear that concepts and criteria that are inoperative in a computerized environment make the choice of access points a costly and complex process requiring intellectually challenging decisions. Catalogs need to be made more informative by providing a greater number of access points. Technological developments have shown that online catalogs need not be subject to the same restrictions as those that limit access to the information held in manual catalogs.

RULE PRINCIPLES AND CHOICE OF ACCESS POINTS

Rules should not interfere with the speed and economy of cataloguing, nor should they limit the capacity of a catalog to provide information for retrieval.^{17,18} There are two principles that work against current needs in electronic and computerized environments: the main entry heading and the rule of three.

The Main Entry Heading

The main entry heading [see Reference 19 for a review in Spanish] is a controversial concept both terminologically and historically, and it is no coincidence that this element is at the heart of the current debate in cataloguing theory and practice. This article will not attempt to cover the pros and cons of maintaining this entry in cataloguing rules, but will instead argue that the main entry heading has given rise to needlessly complex rules that make it difficult to choose access points. Moreover, if the future of cataloguing lies in the development of expert systems, as advocated by Thomas and Younger,²⁰ it will be necessary to redefine the principles that underlie such systems or revise and simplify existing rules so that they provide support for cataloguing as a completely automatic process.

The term "main entry heading," as used in this article, refers not to the main entry described in the AACR2R as a complete record of a catalogued item, but to the heading of the entry of the item, as described by Bierbaum.²¹ In a sense the main entry heading is but one more access point of the many that represent the document in the authority file. In a manual work setting, the confusion between main entry-bibliographic record and main entry-main entry heading does not interfere with storage or retrieval, as both elements are obvious to the user on physical catalog cards, which are filed alphabetically. However, in a computerized setting the confusion between terms can cause problems, as the access points in bibliographic records are linked, which obviates the need for visible entry headings that perform an organizing function. The distinction between main entry as bibliographic record versus main entry heading in databases is invisible, and hence unnecessary, during computerized retrieval operations. Thus access points perform no organizing function in computerized records, and can potentially be used in an indiscriminate manner for retrieval, regardless of the field they occupy in a MARC record or their status as main or added entry in the record.

This means that the hierarchy of main and added entry headings is of no practical use in online catalogs.²² All entry headings in the catalog are considered of equal importance as long as they have been indexed. However, it is also true, as Winke pointed out,²³ that computerized systems allow for increasingly refined searching, so that entries coded as main entries could be used restrictively. Madison noted that

the main entry heading was of dubious value in view of the effort required to choose it, but noted, in its defense, that the main author associated with the title of the work was the best method to identify retrieved items on different screens (abbreviated formats) of online catalogs.²⁴ Nonetheless, these advantages probably do not compensate for the work needed to decide which access point deserves to be designated the "main" one.

The obligation of assigning the status of main entry heading to the main author of a work (if the main author is unknown or unclear, a substitute is sought) is what makes the rule complicated. This principle, implicitly or explicitly, forms the foundation of all rules regarding the choice of access points. The criteria for choosing access points are little more than derivations or qualifications of the main entry principle. As a result the choice of the main access point is based on the authorship conditions of a given work.

In single-author works the choice is straightforward, as long as the conditions under which an author is considered a creator of the work are clearly defined, which unfortunately is not the case in the *Reglas de Catalogación Españolas* (Spanish Cataloguing Rules, hereafter RCE).²⁵ Things become more complicated when there is more than one author, and when multiple responsibilities arise. The matter is complicated even further if different authors perform different tasks; the main author must then be identified and assigned access point status. Identification of the main author is especially difficult when personal names and corporate body names appear under a variety of labels such as (1) shared responsibility as joint authors or collaborating authors of a monograph or a collection of works, (2) mixed responsibility, when different authors perform different types of creative actions, and (3) corporate authors, such as the territorial authorities that are often used as the initial element in the main entry heading and rarely operative as search terms for users without a good knowledge about the heading structure for Government Bodies and Officials. Many other examples could be cited to illustrate the complexity of the process of choosing the main access point. Authors excluded from consideration as the main entry heading receive secondary status; moreover, the number of these is determined by other complex choice mechanisms that are not always evident.

The rules in general, and the RCE in particular, are confusing with respect to these processes, and do not take into account that an author

can be associated with a work through a variety of different authorship conditions. In addition, the different designations used for authorship functions, the ambiguity of the rules, and the lack of rules for determining responsibilities make the choice of main and added entries a complicated, speculative process that does not always lead to the most satisfactory solution.

Other arguments for simplifying the rules for choosing access points have been published. Meador and Wittig, in an analysis of a collection of economics books, found that only 12 of the 143 rules in chapter 21 of the AACR2R were of use for cataloguing the material, and that for a collection of chemistry books, only 22 of the rules were useful.²⁶ Abrera and Shaw studied a sample of 716 books on different disciplines from their records in the OCLC database, and found that only 45 (31.5%) of the 143 rules had been used to determine their access points.²⁷ Winke posited that a nucleus of general rules would be sufficient for choosing suitable access points in most cases.²⁸

The Rule of Three

The rule of three, a convention inherited from Cutter and the age of manual cataloguing, was basically the result of concerns over limitations of space and labor. The virtually limitless storage capacity now available for computerized catalogs, which contain only a single bibliographic record for each work, completely invalidate this rule. Limiting entries to a "manageable number" makes it impossible to create a reference catalog that links all works that a given author has created or collaborated in, or all editions of a given work, and turns the catalog into a simple search list. If access points are classified as essential, desirable (which would increase their retrievability), and optional (which would optimize retrieval and facilitate searches based on elements that do not necessarily coincide with uniform headings), then a true reference catalog would be one that is based on all three categories.

The rule of three deprives most joint authors and collaborators in any other responsibility function of a place in the index. Many authors have pointed out that the rule has become an anachronism in the age of computers. According to Boll, it neglects authors who have made substantial contributions to works that make up a considerable proportion of the holdings in any catalog.²⁹ Svenonius and colleagues examined a sample of monographs in which 22% of the titles had more

than three authors, and wondered if it wasn't possible to go beyond the rule of three to provide access points for each named author. They nonetheless cautioned that this would increase the authority work.³⁰ Brunt reported that removing the limitation to three authors in the statement of responsibility would lead to an immediate improvement in accessibility of information. This would lead in turn to the need to create legitimate access points for names other than the ones appearing in the first positions in the list of authors on the title page.³¹

In the strongest criticism of the rule of three to date, Lin has questioned the additional considerations on added entries in chapter 21 of the AACR2, and has argued that at least all main responsibilities, regardless of the number of authors involved, should be used as access points in the catalog. The user may forget the names of some of the authors responsible for a work (including the first author), or may forget part or all of the title. Added entries, considered as a sort of safety net for retrieval purposes, are not considered or analyzed adequately in the rules.³² Lin consequently asks: "Why three and not two, four or five? Does the location of a name as first author mean that this person made the greatest contribution, or that this person is better known than the other authors?" These are assumptions that are not backed up by research. If a user needs to find a book with four authors, the user will not be able to locate the work if he or she does not know the title and the name of the first author. The remaining authors, although they will be present in the index if other works by them as a single author are catalogued, will not be linked to works of which they are coauthors. Catalogs do not provide access points capable of solving these retrieval problems. Librarians are in fact censoring contributing authors or authors who performed added functions by discriminating against them in terms of the number of catalog entries. The rule of three thus has the effect of limiting computerized catalogs to little more than tools for printing out catalog cards.

Many commercial databases, in response to the increase in the mean number of authors per work, have used computer technology to overcome the magic number of three (or six) in effect for so long. Medline, for example, indexes up to 24 authors for a given article,^{33,34} for obvious reasons, the Science Citation Index includes all authors.³⁵ What is at risk is not only the retrievability of records and of all works potentially linkable to a given author, but also the right of all authors to be represented in the indexes. As recent commentaries have shown,

this right has begun to concern authors, especially those who publish original research, in view of the increasingly frequent use of databases to evaluate their scientific productivity.^{36,37}

OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

This article offers logical criteria that might serve as a basis for modifying existing rules. The aims of the proposed revisions are (1) to shorten the decision-making process for choosing author access points, (2) to reduce ambiguities and inconsistencies, deal with cases not covered by existing rules, and eliminate superfluous rules, and (3) to make the rules more flexible and better adapted to the retrieval capabilities of computerized catalogs.

The goals that informed these proposals for changes in the process of choosing author access points for monographs in Spanish were to simplify the rules and increase the number of access points. The principles that underlie the current rules that I believe should be eliminated or reformulated in conceptual and operational terms are (1) the main entry heading principle, (2) the rule of three, (3) the title page as an almost exclusive source of access points, and (4) the nonregulated status of many access points.

In methodological terms, the present proposal is based on the principle that all personal and corporate body names associated with an item, regardless of their location, are a potential access point for that item's record. However, this principle cannot be implemented without qualification, as this would lead to illogical access points (i.e., access points that the user cannot predict) incompatible with information retrieval needs. The choices should be guided by measures designed to control the use of the information that the item is able to provide. These measures can be summarized as:

- Establishing criteria for associating the names of persons or entities given in the work with responsibilities
- Developing a taxonomy in Spanish of responsibility functions, i.e., a set of terms (and their equivalences in English) to describe the different responsibility functions that can be associated with a work
- Categorizing these functions on the basis of their importance for the existence of the work

This procedure is basically similar to that initially used at UCLA in

the Cataloguing project,³⁸⁻⁴⁰ aimed at providing criteria for revising the AACR2, which were subsequently developed by this group.⁴¹ For the present study I used the RCE as the basis for the proposals described below; nonetheless, because of the similarities between the RCE and AACR2, the methods used here can be considered equally valid for the Spanish cataloguing rules.

PROPOSED METHOD FOR CHOOSING AUTHOR ACCESS POINTS

The use of authors' names as access points continues to be of key importance in document searching and retrieval. Arguments in favor of this type of information have changed little since the criteria of Cutter or the principles established at the 1961 International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in Paris.⁴² Meador and Wittig showed that 65% of all medical studies and 85.66% of all economics studies were retrieved with the names of the authors.⁴³

However, the choice of access points based on the authorship or responsibility principle raises a number of problems, most of which involve either the choice of main entry headings linked to the authorship concept, or the number, type, and characteristics of the access points. The concept of authorship needs to be reconsidered and updated. Although this problem has been analyzed from a theoretical standpoint [see Wajenberg for a history of published definitions and implications⁴⁴], no satisfactory proposal for cataloging has been reported to date. Hence, if the authorship concept continues to be used as the basis of choice decisions, a number of questions need to be answered:

- What are the functions, roles and circumstances by which an author's name can be associated with a work?
- What combinations of authors exist?
- How can the different types of author be ranked in order of importance of their contribution?
- How are the different authors designated in a work?

A set of revised rules would need to clarify these issues to protect the cataloguer from the risks of making subjective decisions. The rules should be designed to favor their application on the basis of the nature and type of problem to be solved, rather than the number of cases.⁴⁵

Once all potential authors have been identified, the cataloguer must then decide how many access points of each type the work requires. The existing rule leaves many questions unanswered. According to the RCE, for items with multiple authors, regardless of the specific type of contribution, the number and type of access points is to be determined by exclusion, i.e., by using as access points all information not subsumed in the main entry heading, all authors other than the one whose name appears first, or only the first three authors. This procedure is costly in terms of intellectual decision-making, and reduces the entire text of the rule to little more than a choice between including or excluding authors that may already be included in the main entry heading. Of the excluded authors, one, or a maximum of three, are usually designated as added entries; however, all three are chosen from among the authors already considered in the main entry heading. What is to be done with the other contributors? Which responsibilities are being systematically excluded from consideration? What happens to contributors whose names do not appear on the title page? And to those whose names do appear in the table of contents? How should entities that appear as associated with a publication but that do not have any direct responsibility function be catalogued?

The RCE attempts unsuccessfully to deal with these questions in a section at the end of chapter 14 (Sección 14.7, Entradas secundarias [Added entries]), and in a few footnotes on the regulation of title access points. Clearly, this ambiguity leads to inconsistencies between catalogs.

To ensure consistency in decision-making, the rules for choosing the number and type of access points for a record should be based on (1) the identification and characterization of all elements of information that appear in association with an item, and that can potentially be used as an indexable access point, and (2) elimination of differences between main and added headings to categorize access points, and use instead of a categorization of all access points. This would facilitate the initial decision process and make it easier to decide which types of information to exclude as potential access points.

Typification and Characterization of Author Access Points

The RCE for determining author access points define an author as a person or body involved in the action of writing or intellectual or artistic creation. For a corporate author as the main entry point, the

rules also consider characteristics that the content of the work they are associated with should satisfy.

The concept of author has traditional connotations that do not help simplify the selection process: (1) It is associated more often with a personal author name. (2) It is associated mainly with the act of writing. (3) It is associated most often with main author. However, in contrast with the concept of authorship, the concept of responsibility, understood to mean any action or participation in the intellectual, artistic or material creation of the work, is broader in scope, and therefore applicable to any type of authorship. Responsibility may be associated with personal action (personal name) or collective action (corporate body). By using the principle of responsibility rather than authorship, and disregarding a priori conditions that must be satisfied to consider a person or a body as an author, the cataloging process is simplified: any personal or corporate name associated with a work is a potential access point for that item's record. Potential author access points are thus all those that can be used as a retrieval term, regardless of its source location.

However, this approach cannot be implemented without due consideration of the peculiarities of certain items. Not all names bear the same type of relation with an item, and in some situations the names do not yield access points that a user would find logical for retrieval. An example would be names with no relation to responsibilities associated with the intellectual or material content of the item. This occurs with names that serve as the subject of the document, e.g., names that identify persons that the document is about, or with bodies named in the authors' affiliations, which are neglected as access points in catalogs, but are indispensable in bibliographic databases, where they are used in bibliometric studies. Consequently "each name an access point," while not a valid principle for the rule, does contain basic elements that are methodologically useful for developing better rules for working with computerized catalogs:

- It represents a premise for simplifying choice criteria and decision-making, as it does not establish a priori conditions for considering a given person or a body as an author.
- It does not impose a limitation on the number of author access points.

- It de-emphasizes the title page as an almost exclusive source of access points.

However, this approach lacks exclusion criteria that restrict author access points to those persons or bodies which are useful in practical terms for information retrieval. The following procedure is suggested to select useful, operative access points:

- Classification of authors according to an established taxonomy that delimits and defines the bibliographic functions of each type of author
- Categorization of these functions on the basis of their importance for the item to be catalogued

The classification process would then consist of two stages. The initial decision would identify all authors who contribute to the existence of the publication, distinguishing between those who contribute to the intellectual or artistic content of the work, and those who participate in the physical production, publication and distribution of the work. Together these two groups of authors represent all the responsibilities associated with all bibliographical aspects of the document. The first group provides most of the author access points, and also presents most of the identification and classification problems. In the second group, only the publisher can be considered an access point. Other responsibilities associated with the material production of the work (e.g., the printer, designer, bookjacket designer, etc.) are rarely used to retrieve modern monographs, although they can be used for older holdings.

In the first group of contributors, i.e., those responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of the work, a further distinction is needed between significant responsibilities in the production of the content, and accompanying responsibilities. This second step in the cataloging process brings us to the greatest problem that the present proposal attempts to solve: gauging the degrees of involvement of different responsibilities in the intellectual or artistic creation of the work to be catalogued. In the rules, these degrees of responsibility are conditioned by the concept of authorship, its implications, and occasionally the source location of authors. As argued above, the concept of authorship in the rules is inoperative in an online environment, and leads to ambiguities. What is needed is an indicator (i.e., a formal

distinguishing mark) that, associated with names, helps to accurately determine the degree of responsibility in the production of the document's contents. This unambiguous, objectively observable marker indicates the type of responsibility for the final purpose of the work. This role is reflected in documents by responsibility functions, i.e., the type of action of each author in the work.

To be able to use this indicator, all possible functions associated with the existence of a monograph need to be identified beforehand. I have therefore developed a taxonomic key of responsibility functions for the Spanish linguistic context, with equivalences in English (Appendix 1). In the list, each function is defined, broken down into its specific tasks, and distinguished from other functions.

The choice of function labels for inclusion in this taxonomy was not without problems. A large variety of terms are used to designate different responsibility functions. Different national cataloging rules (AACR2, RCE, AFNOR) contain important conceptual differences in the functions they consider. In several cases it was difficult to delimit overlapping responsibilities.

Appendix 2 shows other functions that can be associated with a work, but that do not significantly aid information retrieval. I therefore propose that they should not be used as potential access points.

Categorization of Author Access Points

I used the taxonomic key (Appendix 1) as a basis for the procedure to categorize author access points. The key is based on the degree of importance of the association between a corporate or personal author and the final purpose of the work. This criterion is used to distinguish between authors that fulfilled a function without which the document would not have existed, and other authors whose function was not indispensable for the existence of the work.

The classification in Table 1 is not intended as a definitive set of divisions between different types of authors, but rather as a proposal that provides a practical, operational aid in cataloging tasks. The proposed system was derived from the nature and importance of each function in the work.

These groups of authors are distinguished on the basis of functional characteristics. The first group comprises authorship actions that give rise to a new, original work (creative actions) and those that add to or modify an existing work to such an extent that the content or aim of

TABLE 1. Categories of responsibility functions and types of authorship in modern Spanish monographs

CATEGORY (Type of action)	TYPE OF AUTHORSHIP (Personal or corporate name)
<p>First group Total, partial, or significant responsibility functions associated with production of the contents</p>	<p>Autor, Coautor, Colaborador, Adaptador, Continuador, Actualizador, Revisor, Editor-Compilador, Editor-Preparador, Director-Coordinador, Compendiador, Comentador, Anotador, Crítico, Ilustrador-Dibujante-Fotógrafo, Traductor, Redactor, Relator-Relatador.</p>
<p>Second group Responsibility functions associated with the production of accompanying material, or auxiliary contributions to the work</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Prologuistas</u> Autores de Prólogos, Introducciones, Notas Preliminares, Presentaciones, Advertencias, Prefacios, Proemios, Prolegómenos, Epílogos, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Colaboradores en Materias Auxiliares</u> Autores de Apéndices, Bibliografías, Índices, Tablas, Suplementos, Anexos, etc.</p>
<p>Third group Functions associated with the physical production and dissemination of the work</p>	<p>Editor Comercial, Impresor, Distribuidor</p>

the original work has been modified (significant actions other than those involving the creation of a work). In the second group, authorship actions serve to present an existing work without changing its content, or to use the contents to elaborate a secondary product that contains no original material, and without which the original work continues to exist and maintains its full significance and scope (auxiliary noncreative actions). The actions in the third group are tasks related with the material production and distribution of the work rather than the creation of its contents.

The aim of the next step is to further classify authors in the first and the second groups. The system I propose here is intended to provide criteria for deciding how important each author is for the existence of the work. This is in fact a traditional choice between main and added

authors, which the current rules implement in terms of the hierarchy of main and added access points. Although this hierarchy is clearly reflected in practice, it is not defined in clear and unambiguous terms in any of the source authorities for cataloguing rules, and the concepts needed to distinguish between types of authors are nowhere made clear. Madison noted as much in her analysis of the problems raised by definitions in the Revised AACR2.⁴⁶ Objective, observable elements that can be used to identify the presence of different types of authors are also lacking. The presence of phrases such as “if principal responsibility is attributed to (or is presented as) . . . enter under the heading . . .”, together with allusions to priority in the order of appearance, sources of data presentation, or typographical features in the title page in terms of main access point, means that for many publications, discovering the main access point is a laborious, speculative and subjective process.

Our proposal for selecting authors is based on two criteria: the indicators of author identity and responsibility function (1) must be observable and clearly identified in the source of information available in the work, and (2) must indicate the importance of each responsibility function for the existence of the work. These features can be used to distinguish between responsibility functions in a much more objective way than is implicit in the current cataloguing rules and practices for determining the importance of different functions.

Use of the first criterion makes it possible to distinguish two major groups of responsibilities: (1) those for whom no function is identified, and (2) those with a function identifier. The second criterion, which distinguishes between the nature and importance to the work of each action defined by a function, distinguishes between four types of action: (1) creative actions, (2) non-creative actions that are important for the existence of the work, (3) non-creative actions related with accompanying matter or contents, and (4) non-creative actions related with production and dissemination.

If no function identifier is given for an author, it can be assumed that the author performed a creative action. In works of mixed responsibility, a function indicator usually distinguishes between the different types of creative contributions. These indicators (with the exception of identifiers for adaptors and continuers) do not signify separate types of action, but are rather clarifications of the type of contribution that each creating author has made. An example of such a case is the collaboration between a writer and an artist (“Text

by _____, photographs by _____”). The function associated with an author indicates the type of action he or she has performed, and distinguishes these authors from the creator of the work.

The advantages of using the two classification systems are clear.

1. Authors with no function indicator: Personal and corporate body names(including conference names) of creative authors
2. Authors with a function indicator
 - 2.1. Creative authors in mixed responsibilities
 - 2.2. Non-creative authors in important functions
 - 2.3. Non-creative authors in auxiliary functions
 - 2.4. Non-creative authors in functions of production and dissemination

Each responsibility function identified in the taxonomic key (Appendix 1) can be assigned to one of these categories. The results of this operation are summarized in Table 2.

Basic Criteria for Choosing Author Access Points

The basic criteria that inform the proposed revision of the Spanish Cataloguing Rules are listed below. These criteria are rooted in the categories of responsibility functions shown in Table 2, and in the goals of simplifying the text of the rules and increasing the number of possible author access points. I have called these specific proposals “criteria” rather than “rules” because this proposal does not go so far as to redact the actual text of new rules, but is instead intended to set down the principles upon which the new rules could be based.

1. By identifying the function indicator I offer the cataloguer a simple mechanism for the initial identification of responsibilities. The first step in the cataloguing process is thus to decide for each author whether a function is indicated or not.
2. By categorizing the different actions that an author can fulfill in a work, I provide the cataloguer with a scale by which to judge the importance of each responsibility function for the existence of the work; hence the importance of each function for purposes of retrieval. This allows the cataloguer to appraise the importance of each author as an access point for the item.

3. By assigning each responsibility function to its corresponding category, the cataloguer quickly obtains a straightforward classification. The text of the appropriate rule should include the key shown in Appendix 1 as an aid in identifying and classifying different responsibility functions.

TABLE 2. Categories of responsibility functions and types of authorship that can be used to catalog works

FUNCTION INDICATOR	CATEGORY (Type of action)	TYPE OF AUTHORSHIP (Personal or corporate body name)
Authors with no function indicator	Creative authors	Autor, Coautor, Colaborador
Authors with function indicator	Creative authors, mixed responsibility	Autor, Coautor, Colaborador, Adaptador, Continuador
	Non-creative authors, important functions	Actualizador, Revisor, Editor-Compilador, Editor-Preparador, Director-Coordinador, Compendiador, Comentador, Anotador, Crítico, Ilustrador-Dibujante-Fotógrafo, Traductor, Redactor, Relator-Relatador.
	Non-creative authors, auxiliary functions	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Prologuistas</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Autores de Prólogos, Introducciones, Notas Preliminares, Presentaciones, Advertencias, Prefacios, Proemios, Prolegómenos, Epílogos, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Colaboradores en Materias Auxiliares</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Autores de Apéndices, Bibliografías, Índices, Tablas, Suplementos, Anexos, etc.</p>
	Non-creative authors, publication and dissemination functions	Editor Comercial, Impresor, Distribuidor

Once the cataloguer had determined the importance for purposes of information retrieval for each responsibility function, the text of the rule provides the criteria needed to make the decisions summarized in the two points below.

1. Each access point for each category of author or responsibility function should be considered either obligatory (i.e., authors whose names must be used) or optional (i.e., authors whose names can also be used). These criteria have been adopted by the French Cataloguing Rules.^{47,48}
2. The text of the rule should establish whether there is to be a limit to the number of possible access points when more than one author is identified with a given responsibility function. However, each library or center may also decide whether to limit the number of access points under each responsibility function on the basis of its own cataloguing policies.

Table 3 summarizes the type, number and source of access points allowable in each category of responsibility function according to the proposed revision of the Spanish Cataloguing Rules.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The usefulness of a computerized catalog is judged mainly by how its information retrieval system performs. Retrieval functions are being constantly improved as information technology progresses, but still depend to a large degree on decisions made during the cataloguing process, and on the rules that guide these decisions.

The principles described here for determining author access points simplify the decision-making process and make it more objective, increase the number of possible access points, and are compatible with the capabilities of computerized cataloguing. Catalogs need to be made more informative by providing a greater number of access points. However, implementation of these principals in cataloguing rules will require further study.

A variety of procedures have already been tested. Cockshutt et al. used flow charts to illustrate the paths used in the rules to choose access points, in an attempt to shorten the process and remove ambiguities, omissions, and unneeded rules.⁴⁹ Baughman and Svenonius

TABLE 3. Access points for each category of responsibility function. Type, number and source of information

CATEGORY (Type of action)	TYPE OF ACCESS POINT		NUMBER OF ACCESS POINTS		INFORMATION SOURCE	
	Obligatory	Optional	All	Unspecified (1)	Title page	Any source (2)
Creative authors	x		x			x
Creative authors, mixed responsibility	x		x			x
Non-creative authors, important functions	x		x			x (3)
Non-creative authors, auxiliary functions		x		x		x (4)
Non-creative authors, publication and dissemination functions	x (5)		x			x

(1) To be determined by the library or center on the basis of the type of holdings and users

(2) Includes the Table of Contents

(3) The library or center can determine which sources to use

(4) The library or center can determine which sources to use

(5) Obligatory access points for the publisher only; alternatively, for the printer or distributor

examined the effects of removing the heading "Main entry" and replacing each instance of this term with "access point" throughout the text. They found that the substitution led to meaningless rules and rules that became very complex or inoperative.⁵⁰ Abrera and Shaw proposed simplifying the rules after having determined empirically which rules were actually used in practice; they concluded that only a small group of rules was used consistently. A nucleus of rules selected on the basis of practical considerations was in fact sufficient to catalog most of the books in their sample.⁵¹

Computerized procedures for identifying access points have also been developed. These procedures used algorithms that matched the names on the title page with names in the authority file in a database, with a high degree of precision.^{52,53} One recent study has attempted to revise the AACR2 on the basis of a computerized analysis of the syntax of the text of the rules and the interrelations between criteria, in an attempt to eliminate useless or unneeded clauses, integrate multiple

criteria, unify terminology and improve the structure of the rules.⁵⁴ Recently, Molto and Svenonius have developed a prototype electronic interface in an attempt to reconfigure the use of AACR2 rules to make them more useful for automated environments. The problems they encountered stemmed from structural problems in the rules themselves; this is one of the major problems we also found in the Spanish cataloging rules.⁵⁵

In the proposal presented in this article, I have discussed the need to break with previous concepts, incorporate new principles and develop highly precise reference tools. In the present article I have proposed a revised system for choosing author access points in the Spanish linguistic context. Two fundamental elements of the revised method for choosing author access points are the taxonomic key of twenty different responsibility functions (Appendix 1) and the table of author categories (Table 2). I suggest that this method could be used for monographs in any language. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the proposed method can only be implemented once the national rules have developed an appropriate taxonomic key that clearly and precisely defines the responsibility functions encountered within a given linguistic and terminological environment.

We are now investigating the application of this revised set of principles for cataloging a real sample of modern Spanish monographs held in the National Library of Spain and in university libraries. With this approach we hope to identify specific shortcomings in cataloging procedures based on current rules.

REFERENCES

1. IFLA, *Guidelines for Authority and Reference Entries* (London: IFLA International Programme for UBC, 1984). IFLA, *Guidelines for Subject Authority and Reference Entries*. Working Group on "Guidelines for Subject Authority Files" on the Section on Classification and Indexing of the IFLA Division of Bibliographic Control (London: IFLA, 1993).
2. Frederick W. Lancaster and Linda C. Smith, *Compatibility Issues Affecting Information Systems and Services* (PGI83/WS/23) (Paris: Unesco, 1983).
3. Anne M. Hasund Langballe, "Brief Cataloguing in Card and Online Catalogues," *International Cataloging & Bibliographic Control* 20, 3 (April/June 1991): 28-31.
4. Jay H. Lambrecht, *Minimal Level Cataloguing by National Bibliographic Agencies* (Munich: Saur, 1992) (UBCIM Publication; N.S., Vol. 8).
5. AFNOR, Z 44 - 059 (1987): *Documentation: Catalogage-Choix des Accès à la Description Bibliographique* (Paris: AFNOR, 1990).

6. Paule Rolland-Thomas, "Translating Cataloguing Rules: An Examination of the International Status of AACR2 Through the Translation Process: The French Version," *International Cataloguing & Bibliographic Control* 15, 2 (April/June 1986): 19-21.
7. Esther G. Bierbaum, "A Modest Proposal: No More Main Entry," *American Libraries* 25, 1 (January 1994): 81-84.
8. John J. Boll, "The future of AACR2," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 12, 1 (1990): 3-34.
9. Snunith Shoham and Susan S. Lazinger, "The No-Main-Entry Principle and the Automated Catalog," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 12, 3-4 (1991): 51-67.
10. R. Conrad Winke, "Discarding the Main Entry in an Online Cataloging Environment" *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 16, 1 (1993): 53-70.
11. Margaret E. Cockshutt; C. Cook; Ann H. Schabas, "Decision Logic for Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Chapter 21: Choice of Access Points," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 27, 4 (October/December 1983): 371-90.
12. Josefa Abrera and Debora Shaw, "Frequency of Use of Cataloguing Rules in a Practice Collection," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 36, 2 (1991): 149-61.
13. Roy Meador and Glenn R. Wittig, "AACR2 Rules Used in Assigning Access Points for Books in Two Subjects: Implication for Automatic Cataloging Expert Systems," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 35, 2 (April 1991): 135-40.
14. Elaine Svenonius, Betty Baughman and Mavis Molto, "Title Page Sanctity? The Distribution of Access Points in a Sample of English Language Monographs," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 6, 3 (Spring 1986): 3-21.
15. Edgar A. Jones, "Consistency in Choice and Form of Main Entry: A Comparison of Library of Congress and British Library Monograph Cataloging," *Library Resources and Technical Services* 36, 2 (1992): 209-23.
16. Elaine Svenonius, Betty Baughman and Mavis Molto, "Title Page Sanctity?" p. 5-6.
17. A. Seal, P. Bryant and C. Hall, *Full and Short Entry Catalogues: Library Needs and Uses* (Bath: University, Centre for Catalogue Research, 1982).
18. P. Wilson, "The Catalog as Access Mechanism: Background and Concepts" *Library Resources & Technical Services* 27, 1 (1983): 4-17.
19. J. A. Frias, "El OPAC y el Futuro de los Puntos de Acceso a la Descripción" *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Archiveros, Bibliotecarios y Documentalistas* 47 (Enero-Marzo 1997): 77-100.
20. Sarah E. Thomas and Jennifer A. Younger, "Cooperative Cataloging: A Vision for the Future," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 17, 3-4 (1993): 237-57.
21. Esther G. Bierbaum, "A Modest Proposal: No More Main Entry," p. 81-84.
22. Snunith Shoham and Susan S. Lazinger, "The No-Main-Entry Principle," p. 51-67.
23. R. Conrad Winke, "Discarding the Main Entry," p. 53-70.
24. Olivia M. A. Madison, "The Role of the Name Main-Entry Heading in the Online Environment," *Serials Librarian* 22, 3-4 (1992): 371-91.
25. *Reglas de Catalogación (RCE)*. Ed. ref. y rev. (Madrid: Dirección General del Libro, Archivos y Bibliotecas, 1995).

26. Roy Meador and Glenn R. Wittig, "AACR2 Rules Used in Assigning Access Points," p. 135-40.
27. Josefa Abrera and Debora Shaw, "Frequency of Use of Cataloging Rules," p. 149-61.
28. R. Conrad Winke, "Discarding the Main Entry," p. 53-70.
29. John J. Boll, "The Future of AACR2," p. 3-34.
30. Elaine Svenonius, Betty Baughman and Mavis Molto, "Title Page Sanctity?" p. 3-21.
31. R.M Brunt, "The Code and the Catalogue: A Return to Compatibility," *Library Review* 41, 3 (1992): 29.
32. Joseph C. Lin, "Rule of Three: A Case of Discrimination Against Certain Authors Caused by the Cataloging Rules," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 5, 4 (Summer 1985): 53-65.
33. J. L. Schulman, "New author policy for NLM indexes and database," *NLM Technical Bulletin* 286 (Sept.-Oct. 1995): 17. Available at : [http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/techbull/tb_download.html]
34. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, "Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals," *Ann Intern Med* 126 (1997): 36-47.
35. E. Garfield, "All Sorts of Authorship," *Nature* 389 (1997): 777.
36. R. J. Epstein, "Six Authors in Search of a Citation: Villains or Victims of the Vancouver Convention?" *BMJ* 306 (1993): 765-767.
37. R. Horton; R. Smith, "Signing up for Authorship," *Lancet* 347 (1996): 780.
38. Betty Baughman and Elaine Svenonius, "AACR2: Main Entry Free?" *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 5, 1 (Fall 1984): 1-15.
39. Michael Carpenter and Elaine Svenonius, eds., *Foundations of Cataloging: A Sourcebook* (Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1985).
40. Elaine Svenonius, ed., *The Conceptual Foundations of Descriptive Cataloging* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1989).
41. Elaine Svenonius, Betty Baughman and Mavis Molto, "Title Page Sanctity?" p. 3-21.
42. *International Conference on Cataloguing Principles*, Paris, October 1961, Report (London: Organizing Committee of The International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, 1963), p. 28.
43. Roy Meador and Glenn R. Wittig, "AACR2 Rules Used in Assigning Access Points," p. 135-140.
44. A. S. Wajenberg, "A Cataloger's View of Authorship," *The Conceptual Foundations of Descriptive Cataloging*, edited by E. Svenonius (San Diego: Academic Press, 1989), p. 24.
45. Jennifer E. Rowley, *Organizing Knowledge: An Introduction to Information Retrieval* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1992).
46. Olivia M. A. Madison, "The Role of the Name Main-Entry Heading," p. 372-373.
47. AFNOR, Z 44 - 059 (1987): *Documentation: Catalogage-Choix des accès à la description bibliographique* (Paris: AFNOR, 1987).

48. Neil A. Jacobowitz, "A Comparison of AACR2R and French Cataloging Rules," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, 1 (1995): 47-59.
49. Margaret E. Cockshutt, C. Cook and Ann H. Schabas, "Decision Logic for Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules," p. 371-390.
50. Betty Baughman and Elaine Svenonius, "AACR2: Main Entry Free?" p. 1-15.
51. Josefa Abrera and Debora Shaw, "Frequency of Use of Cataloging Rules," p. 149-161.
52. Mavis Molto and Elaine Svenonius, "Automatic Recognition of Title Page Names," *Information Processing & Management* 27, 1 (1991): 83-95.
53. Elaine Svenonius and Mavis Molto, "Automatic Derivation of Name Access Points in Cataloging," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 41, 4 (1990): 254-263.
54. S. Taniguchi, "A System for Analyzing Cataloging Rules: A Feasibility Study," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 47, 5 (1996): 338-356.
55. Mavis Molto and Elaine Svenonius, "An Electronic Interface to AACR2," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 26, 1 (1998): 3-24.

APPENDIX 1. Taxonomy of responsibility functions in modern Spanish monographs and English equivalents. Functions are shown in roman typeface; equivalent designations in Spanish are shown in italics.

Autor [Author, Writer, Emanator]

Creative author. Person or entity with responsibility for the creation of the content of the work. Can be associated with personal or corporate body authorship, as long as the creative function is evident. Creative authorship can occur in shared and mixed responsibilities

— *No function indicator except in mixed responsibilities*

Coautor [Coauthor, Joint author]

Creative author when two or more authors are given. Author in a group of collective authorship. Creative action shared with no specification of which parts or how much of the content a given coauthor is responsible for, resulting in a collective work. Can occur in shared and mixed responsibilities

— *No function indicator except in mixed responsibilities*

Colaborador [Contributing author, Collaborating author, Collaborator]

Author with a limited role in the creation of the work. Creative action shared with one or more others, or indication of proportion of responsibility with respect to one or more others (1)

— *Colaboración de. . . , Contribución de. . . , Participación de. . .*

Adaptador [Adapter]

1) Author who modifies an existing work to make it accessible to a different public from the one the work was originally intended for, or to make it suitable for another type of reader. 2) Author who modifies a work to the format of a different genre. Adaptation implies the prior existence of an original work by another author(s), which changes in purpose, nature or scope as a result of adaptation. The modifications introduced give rise to a different work; hence the adaptor should be considered to perform a creative action.

— *Adaptación de. . . , Transformada por. . . , Acomodada. . . , Reducida. . . , Modificada. . . , Dibulgada. . . , Versión. . .*

Continuador

Continues and extends a work begun by another/others, to complete and/or update the original work. This function is ambiguous for two reasons: 1) Continuation of a work can be understood as an update (2). 2) A work conceived within the context of another work may not necessarily complete the original work, but may only increase its content. In this case the continuation should be considered a new work, and the author(s) should be considered to perform a creative action. To identify the function of **Continuador**, the function indicators *Continuada por...* and *Continuación de...* can be used, together with publication, under the same or a different title and with the same structure

— *Continuada...*, *Terminada...*, *Proseguida...*, *Finalizada...*

Acutalizador, Revisor [Maintainer, Reviser, Revised version]

1) Author that ensures a work created by another remains up-to-date. 2) Maintains or updates a previously published work by adding, correcting or modifying, for the purpose of keeping the contents up to date. This function does not involve substantial change to the original work, therefore the maintainer is not considered a creative author

— *Corregida por...*, *Aumentada...*, *Renovada...*, *Revisada...*, *Reformada...*, *Ampliada...*, *Puesta al día...*, *Adicionada...*

Editor-Compilador {Editor, Compiler (3)}, **Editor-Preparador**

1) Oversees the publication or presentation, in intellectual terms, of a work, a collective work or part of the same. 2) Responsible for the intellectual production of a collective work (4). 3) Oversees the preparation of a text created by others. Responsibilities can range from complete revision to preparation of the introduction, notes, indices, etc.

The *editor* and *director* are often confused. This confusion arises from mistranslation of the English terms Editor and Director, whose responsibilities can overlap (5). In the Spanish linguistic context these two terms indicate different responsibility functions: *editor-compilador* and *director-coordinador*. Thus in Spanish the term *editor* refers to the supervisor or compiler of the work, who performs the actions of 1) bringing together and publishing material, a collection, or part of the same, and 2) supervising the preparation of the text or of a text created by others, and providing comments, revising or adding to the content.

Confusion also arises when the *editor* is considered to have performed actions of overseeing, revising, or preparing. There are so many possible degrees of significant intellectual involvement in a work that in many cases, some actions are performed by persons with other responsibility functions that have been more clearly defined. Moreover, there is overlap between the specific actions performed by persons or bodies with apparently different responsibility functions.

The AACR2 does not distinguish between the Director of a collective work and the editor-compiler, but regulates both functions in terms of works "under the direction of an editor" and "under the direction of a literary editor." In some cases the editor can be responsible for the editorial direction of a group of authors, or of a group of compilers.

In the Spanish linguistic context the function of the *editor* is understood as that of the *editor-compilador* and the *editor-preparador*. The actions performed by the *editor-preparador* in a work can vary widely, and can be indicated within the document in a variety of ways. The cataloger of monographs in Spanish should pay close attention to equivalent designations as well as overlap and differences in the actions subsumed by apparently equivalent responsibility functions, and avoid attributing to the Spanish *editor* responsibilities that correspond more closely to other better defined functions. This would help avoid the indiscriminate use of the *editor literario* label, which has become a widespread catch-all term in cataloging.

— *Edición de...*, *Edición y estudio*, *Compilada y anotada*, *Editada y...*, *Selección y estudio...*, *Antología de textos*, *Recopilación de...*, *Publicada por...*, *Presentada y...* For Conferences Proceedings, congresses, meetings: *Edición de...*, *Organizado por...*

Director-Coordinador [Editor, Director-Coordinator]

Directs, coordinates or oversees the assembly of a collective work to ensure its coherence or continuity. Acts as intellectual director, in the sense described in the AACR2 rules for the editor in certain cases. In the Spanish linguistic context, the function of the scientific and intellectual director is best defined as one of coordination, for the purpose of ensuring consistency in the methods and contents in collective works.

The *director-coordinador* function can also be associated with the direction of editorial collections. This designation is dealt with in the French cataloging rules (6). The Reglas Españolas de Catalogación define the *director-coordinador* as the *director editorial*, whereas AACR2 do not provide a separate description of this function.

— *Director científico, Director político, Publicación dirigida por. . . , Dirección y planeamiento, Dirección intelectual, Coordinador, Supervisor, Colección dirigida por. . .*

Compendiador

Abrides the contents of a work. This function is not defined in any of the national cataloging rules examined. Reduces or simplifies a work, maintaining its original structure and unity of thought, for the purpose of providing the fundamental contents in a shortened form. The original purpose of the work is not modified.

— *Resumida por. . . , Condensada por. . . , Síntesis de. . . , Sumario, Sinopsis, Extracto, Epítome, Versión abreviada*

Comentador [Commentator, Annotator]

Not defined in the glossary of the Reglas de Catalogación Españolas or in the AACR2. 1) Adds to a work by another author(s) observations, notes, etc., for the purpose of explaining, illustrating, interpreting or clarifying the meaning and scope of the content (7). This function can take the form of many different types of action.

- General criticism: commentary that examines and evaluates the qualities or defects of a work
- Literary criticism: commentary that examines or evaluates a literary work
- Critical study: Analysis, historical and literary study of a text (usually a classic text) with bibliographical notes on the author, and a commentary on the author's times, evaluation of the work, style, influences, and other characteristics. Can be accompanied by other types of material such as appendices and a bibliography of the author.
- Critical edition: The main purpose is re-publication or reconstruction of an original work for the purpose of recovering the author's original intention. This type of action is closer to that of the editor than the commentator.

— *Explicación, Glosa, Anotada por. . . , Criticada, Comentario crítico, Comentario ilustrativo, Interpolación, Estudio, Estudio crítico, Anotaciones críticas, Exégesis, Análisis crítico, Estudio biográfico-crítico, Crítica intelectual, Edición crítica*

Redactor [Redactor, Writer]

Author that gives final form to a document, but is not responsible in a creative sense for its content. This function, in addition to its general action of giving written form to events and ideas, is often associated with reports, official publications, legal publications, and similar documents. It is easily confused with the function of editor. It is not defined in the Reglas de Catalogación Españolas or the AACR2, although it does appear in the AFNOR rules (8).

— *Redacción de. . . , Redactado por. . .*

Relator, Relatador [Narrator]

Prepares a literary or scientific work to report an event or situation. Should not be confused with creative author of a narrative work.

Uncommon in scholarly monographs, often associated with reports to authorities, organizations or institutions (status report, progress report, report on a procedure, report of findings, list, etc.). In the AACR2 this function is associated with judicial records and compendia of trials and sentences. The functions of *redactor* and *relator* are sometimes difficult to distinguish, and can overlap.

— *Relatado por. . . , Informado, Expuesto, Referido, Contado, Narrado*

Colaborador en materias auxiliares [Writer of accompanying material]

This is not described as a separate function in any set of cataloging rules, and is termed here *colaborador en...* to distinguish it from the creative author collaborator. This function involves contributions that are not of fundamental importance for the content of the work, and without which the work could exist on its own, although accompanying material often facilitates the use of the basic work. A variety of terms are used to designate this type of function, to reflect the variety of materials that can accompany a work (e.g., appendices, indices, supplements, tables and bibliographies) and that are prepared by persons or bodies other than the creative author of the work. The contents of the accompanying material are derived from the contents of the work it accompanies.

— *Acompañada de. . . , Bibliografía de. . . , Índices, Apéndices, Tablas, Suplementos, Anexos*

Prologuista [author of the Preface, Prologue or Foreword]

Author of a discourse appearing before the main body of the work, in which the purpose of the work is described, or a commentary on the work or its author(s) is given. This function is well-known, and the resulting material is considered not to be of fundamental importance to the existence of the work. The glossary of the AACR2 contains no entry for "author of a prologue." In the Reglas de Catalogación Españolas, the *prólogo* is defined as a "preliminary note directed to the reader, in which clarifications or observations about the work are given." Many terms are used for this function, and some denote purposes other than that of the prologue. I propose the general term "prologue" be used to refer to introductions written by authors different from that of the main work, presentations, prolegomena, prefaces, notes to the reader, and preliminary notes.

— *Prólogo, Prefacio, Advertencia, Nota preliminar, Noticia preliminar, Presentación, Aclaración, Introducción, Proemio, Prolegómeno, Epílogo*

Ilustrador [Illustrator, Photographer]

1) Author that provides artistic elements inspired by the content of the work with the purpose of emphasizing its importance. 2) Author of the images that accompany the text. 3) Person or body responsible for the illustrations, that are based on or inspired by the text. Distinction should be made between illustrated works and works that are the result of a collaboration between writer and artist (mixed responsibilities), in which both responsibilities are of equal importance for the existence of the work. In this case the illustrator does not provide accompanying material, but is considered a creative author.

— *Ilustraciones de. . . , Iconografía de. . . , Dibujos, Grabados, Fotografías, Figuras, Láminas*

Traductor [Translator]

1) Renders a work in a language other than the one it was originally written in. The translation can be accompanied by an interpretation of the text. 2) "One who renders from one language into another, or from an older form of a language into a modern form, more or less closely following the original" (9). Many types of translation exist (e.g., free, direct, literal). In the present taxonomy all types are considered to represent the translator function, including transcription in both its literal and paleographic sense.

A translation is often presented as a *versión*, which is an imprecise synonym for a specific or special translation. As a result, translations produced by different translators are sometimes considered different "versions" of the original work. When a version includes an interpretation of the subject of the text, it is considered a critical study (commentary). When a version expresses or includes the presentation of the work in a different literary form (dramatization, novelization, etc.) it is considered an adaptation. A free translation can in fact sometimes be an adaptation.

— *Traducción, Traducción autorizada, directa, fiel, indirecta, interlineal, inversa, literal, Transcripción, Versión, Versión española, a partir de, novelada, Traducción libre, anotada, Metáfrasis*

Editor comercial [Publisher]; **Impresor** [Printer]

Person or entity that, in a material sense, produces a work with printing and reproduction techniques for publication and distribution. This function is associated with the dissemination of a document.

The function of publisher has changed with time to involve actions such as design, printing, technical production, and marketing. The role of the publisher as distinct from these other tasks did not appear until the nineteenth century. Before this time publishers often acted as booksellers and printers. These functions are currently entirely separate, although in certain types of documents the publisher and printer are the same person or entity.

— *Edición, Editado, Ediciones, Editorial, Editor-Impresor, Editor-Librero, Impresor-Librero*

Distribuidor [Distributor]

Intermediary responsible for delivering the publisher's products to the bookseller. This function is associated with dissemination. The functions of publisher and distributor are sometimes, but not always, performed by the same person or entity.

— *Distribuida por. . . , Distribución de. . .*

REFERENCES

- (1) J. Martínez de Sousa, *Diccionario de Bibliología y Ciencias Afines* (Salamanca: Fundación Germán Sánchez Ruipérez, 1993), p. 174
- (2) *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., 1988 Revision (Chicago: American Library Association, 1988), p. 351, 617 y 623
- (3) *USMARC Code List for Relators, Sources, Description Conventions*, Prepared by Network Development and MARC Standards Office (Washington: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1990), p. 8
- (4) J. Martínez de Sousa, "Diccionario de Bibliología y Ciencias Afines," p. 305-308
- (5) "Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules," p. 617
- (6) AFNOR, Z 44-059 (1987): *Documentation: Catalogage-Choix des Accès à la Description Bibliographique* (Paris: AFNOR, 1987), p. 130
- (7) AFNOR, Z 44-059 (1987): "Choix des Accès à la Description Bibliographique," p. 140.
- (8) AFNOR, Z 44-059 (1987): "Choix des Accès à la Description Bibliographique," p. 139
- (9) "Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules," p. 624

APPENDIX 2. Types of responsibility functions excluded from the proposed system for choosing author access points¹

RESPONSIBILITY ASSOCIATED WITH THE WORK	DESIGNATION OF THE FUNCTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Authors associated or related to the publication, design and distribution of the work: 	<p>Printer, typesetter, designer, dustjacket designer, binder, production director, production editor, printer, technicians, editorial consultants</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Personal authors related to the organization of events: 	<p>Organizer of tributes, conferences, etc. President or member of conference organizing committee, sponsor, commissioner, consultant</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Personal authors named in: 	<p>Acknowledgement, dedication, introduction or prologue. Persons related to the author or subject of the work</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Entities associated with the works as: 	<p>Sponsor, financier. Institutions named in author affiliations. Institutions provider of sources and data</p>

1. Functions associated with the document but that do not involve creative or intellectual effort or contribution