

FOLLOW-UP: REVISION OF HEADINGS FOR COOKING AND COOKBOOKS

December 23, 2009

The ABA Policy and Standards Division (PSD) of the Library of Congress thanks all who responded to the discussion paper “Revision of Headings for Cooking and Cookbooks” (September 18, 2009) (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/cooking.pdf>). We appreciate the time and thought that went into the comments we received.

DECISION: COOKBOOKS

There was unanimous support for establishing **Cookbooks** as a topical subject heading and general agreement on establishing **Cookbooks** as a genre/form heading. PSD therefore plans to authorize these headings as part of the revisions.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

The responses we received raise some additional issues that are presented here for further consideration and comment.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION 1: COOKERY vs. COOKING

Our first concern relates to the difference between the meaning of the terms **cookery** and **cooking**. Whereas most definitions of the term “Cooking” specify that it is the application of heat to food, the term “Cookery” is often defined more broadly to cover all types of food preparation, including those foods that do not necessarily need to be heated, such as some salads or fruit. Therefore, the term “Cookery” is technically more accurate when describing the preparation of foods that are not heated. It is clear from the responses that we have received, however, that the majority prefer that the heading be “Cooking” rather than “Cookery.” In order to accommodate this viewpoint, it would be necessary to formulate a scope note that defines the term “Cooking” more broadly than the common dictionary definitions. The scope note would have to state explicitly that the term is used broadly to include food preparation of any kind, regardless of whether or not heat is applied.

Is this an acceptable solution? Are there alternative solutions that would be preferable?

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION 2: SPECIFIC FOOD PRODUCTS AND THEIR USE AS INGREDIENTS

We received several suggestions that the phrase **Cooking with [ingredient]** could be used instead of one of the two options presented in the original discussion paper: Option 1: **Cooking--[Ingredient]**; Option 2: **[Ingredient]--Use in cooking**.

The suggestion to use **Cooking with [ingredient]** seems to have merit, in that it would be clear and unambiguous. The heading **Cooking--Bread** could be misconstrued to mean

bread making, when it actually would mean the use of bread as an ingredient. **Cooking with bread**, on the other hand, appears to be less open to misinterpretation.

The formulation **Cooking with bread** would also avoid the introduction of the lead-in language “use in”, which might be problematic in a system that supports faceted browsing. Faceted browsers would display the option 2-style heading as: **Bread--Use in cooking** and as **Use in cooking--Bread**.

The new heading would look like this:

Cooking with bread

UF Cookery (Bread) [*Former heading*]

RT Bread

Is this acceptable or preferable to the options presented in the original paper? Are there other suggestions?

DEADLINE FOR COMMENT

The deadline for comment on these issues is January 7, 2010. The Policy and Standards Division hopes to be able to announce the decisions about the revision of the Cookery headings at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 2010.

Please send your comments to: Libby Dechman edec@loc.gov