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Recommended Citation
Abstract: In doing Hebraica cataloging on RLIN, Yeshiva University (YU) librarians provide full title and statement of responsibility data in the original script. YU catalogers do not, however, provide full romanization of these elements, but stop after the title proper. The Research Libraries Group's definition of cataloging levels requires YU to code its records as less-than-full. It is argued in this paper that the Cataloging Category codes mask the quality of records containing complete bibliographic data in the original script, and that libraries inputting this data are penalized financially.

Definition of Cataloging Categories

At Yeshiva University we have found that application of the cataloging category (CC) in the fixed field as instructed in the RLIN manual, Bibliographic Field Guide, misrepresents the quality of RLIN Hebraica catalog records and undermines their value for copy cataloging. In this paper I address this issue, with special emphasis on field 245 (title and statement of responsibility).

According to the RLIN Field Guide there are four characters in the CC field. Position 1 is always a "9" and position "4" remains static if the original source of the machine-readable record is RLIN (Research Libraries Group) member cataloging. Positions 2 and 3 can be changed according to the fullness of cataloging and content designation in the record. Position 3 deals with the accuracy of tags, indicators, and delimiters—which is not discussed in this paper.

Position 2 of the cataloging category reflects the amount of Roman-alphabet data present in a record. If the Roman fields are incomplete in the catalog record for a book, then the record does not meet RLG full-level standards, and the CC value is then a "5," "6," or "9" (see Note 1), indicating a less than full-level record. Since this determination is based solely on the romanized fields, this rule affects libraries inputting records in the vernacular.

To quote from the section on "Non-Roman Cataloging Standards" in the Non-Roman Supplement to Cataloging in RLIN II (Stanford, CA: The Research Libraries Group, 1987),

"The level of cataloging in an RLIN record is determined only by the romanized fields, and is not affected by the amount of non-Roman data the record contains. If a record fulfills only the requirements for RLG base-level cataloging (second CC position is "5"), the addition of non-Roman fields does not raise its level to RLG full-level cataloging (second CC position is "1"). Adding non-Roman fields is valuable, however, because such fields make the record retrievable with non-Roman searches" (p. 17).

Our policy, at Yeshiva University, is to follow AACR2 (Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed.), LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings), and RLG standards to the extent possible. We do not consider a record finished unless it has all the AACR2 required fields—in Roman and in Hebrew script. At present we enter only full-level records into the database (as defined by US).

Deviation from RLG Standards

We deviate from RLG standards in one respect: we enter only the brief romanized title (that is, the subfield (title proper) portion of the romanized 245 field. However, our Hebrew-script 245 field is always complete. We follow this policy because the Hebrew subtitles and statements of responsibility are usually extremely long, making it difficult and time-consuming to romanize, proofread, and input these elements. In any case, our library users access the Hebrew titles rather than the romanized titles.

This approach is not new to the library world: it is reflected in numerous Library of Congress printed catalog cards with only the Hebrew title proper romanized. In addition, the Cataloging Subcommittee of the RLG Jewish and Middle East Studies Program (the former "JAMES" Committee) submitted a proposal and then a revised proposal to LC and RLG on this matter. The Library of Congress (LC) published this proposal in its Cataloging Service Bulletin (CSB) (#49, Summer 1990). According to the "JAMES" Final Report (1991, 3 pages) "the proposal is under study at RLG for standards issues." We have not heard anything since.

In Figure 1a the "original record" is missing field 300 (physical description), the 500s (notes), 600s (subject headings), and 700s (added entries). The CC value "9994" indicates that the record does not meet any RLG level of cataloging. Figure 1b, Yeshiva University's record, was derived from this original record according to RLIN rules. It is evident that YU's record is much fuller. Nevertheless, RLG standards require us to input a CC value of "9" because the full 245 field is not romanized. If such records are coded as substandard, i.e., "9" (not meeting any RLG level of cataloging), then libraries searching for records from which to derive cataloging, based on the CC value alone, may automatically dismiss perfectly good records.

Conversely, if the inputting library's CC value indicates "full-level" or "1," a cataloger should be able to assume that this record meets RLG's full level of cataloging standards for books. This is not necessarily the case, however.
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The CC in its current form is thus misleading, as it masks the sources of quality cataloging copy. Figure 2 illustrates this point.

In accordance with the JAMES proposal, I suggest that RLIN institute a new CC value which would reflect full-level cataloging in all aspects of a vernacular record, with the exception of the romanized 245 subfields b and c, i.e., other title and statement of responsibility.

Instituting a new value in the CC Field would restore the integrity of the coding system. This has financial implications for libraries doing Hebraica cataloging, as there are currently no rebates for input of original script, only for full romanization.

Note
1. In the RLIN Supplement to USMARC Bibliographic Format: Fixed Fields the Cataloging Category, Position 2 codes are as follows:

Position 2 Level of cataloging (Roman-alphabet portion only)
- 1 Meets RLG full level of cataloging (BKS, CIT, MAP, MDF, REC, SCO, SER, VIM).
- 2 Meets RLG base level of cataloging/ meets RLG AMC standard.
- 3 Does not meet any RLG level of cataloging.
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