

To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Steven Arakawa (Chair), Everett Allgood, John Attig, Dorothy McGarry,
Kate Harcourt, Betsy Mangan

Re: Incorporating FRBR terminology into AACR: work in response to 4JSC/Chair/76

This response is written to address what appear to be the larger implications of incorporating FRBR terminology into AACR. The rule proposals included in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* have been reviewed not so much as formal proposals but rather as exemplars of what FRBR incorporation would mean for the integrity of AACR.

However, because details in the proposed revisions to Chapter 1 may have an impact on the progress of work on the ALA Task Force on Consistency Across Part I of AACR2, John Attig has provided a list of specific responses in the Appendix at the end of this document.

To be deemed successful, incorporation of FRBR terminology into AACR ought to move the rules in the direction of greater clarity and precision. Consistency with FRBR is a worthy goal, but it should not be the ultimate one. Introducing greater ambiguity into AACR in order to achieve consistency with FRBR is not a price worth paying. However, it may be the case that certain difficulties reconciling FRBR terminology with AACR may point to underlying inconsistencies in the rules themselves, or perhaps to inadequacies in FRBR terminology, and some resolution or clarification may be the result; this would more than justify the exercise.

The comments and responses generally follow the order of presentation in the document under review. Among those involved in the discussion there was sometimes strong disagreement on certain points, and there are a number of places in this document where issues formulated as alternatives reflect the reviewers' agreement to disagree. Certainly this document cannot be considered a list of consensus recommendations, but it is to be hoped that it will encourage scrutiny of some of the key issues that appear to be at stake.

- ✓ **FRBR definitions for “Work,” “Expression,” and “Manifestation” are too brief.** In the absence of an explanatory text in the body of the rules, they seem cryptic. Why is it necessary to leave out description of attributes or other characteristics? For the working cataloger, the definition of “expression” would surely be more helpful if it included a list of types of expressions, e.g. translations, revised editions, abridged editions, and so on. If we are asking catalogers to buy into a new conceptual revision of the rules, definitions should do as much as possible to orient the user in the new universe.

As an aside, the phrase “manifestation of a work” or some variation of it is used frequently, e.g. the definition for **Collective title**. Presumably the phrase is used as a shorthand for “manifestation of an expression (or expressions) of a work.” The shorthand is understandable, but perhaps an expanded definition should point this out,

and perhaps an effort should be made to use “manifestation of an expression” when appropriate.

- ✓ **Revised definition of “bibliographic resource” as substitute term for AACR “item.”** While most readers of the document had no objection to use of the term “bibliographic resource” as a substitute for AACR “item,” JSC might want to consider whether it is really necessary to introduce a term that in practice appears to be substituting revised Chapter 12 terminology (“resource”) for the FRBR term “manifestation.”

First, *the case for “bibliographic resource”* (as a *concept*; there are some qualifications about its use as a *term* outlined below). Pat Riva’s exposition of the current use of “item” in AACR is not quite correct. According to the definitions from Tom Delsey’s model of Part I of AACR which she quotes, “item” is not a “real world” entity; it is what Delsey calls a “cipher” entity, an abstraction created by the cataloger as part of the procedure for determining the boundaries of what is being described in a single bibliographic record. Delsey contrasts this with “document” which is the “real world” counterpart — the miscellaneous stuff that crosses the cataloger’s desk and which she has to organize into “items” to be described.

To expand on this point, “item” in the AACR model is not on the same plane of reality as the FRBR Type 2 entities. These form a continuum that ranges from highly abstract (work) to singularly concrete (item). Think of this continuum as a line running across our conceptual map of the bibliographic universe. “Item” (in the AACR sense) can be thought of as a frame that the cataloger moves across that line until she is satisfied that it frames exactly the view that is to be described in a bibliographic record. Thus, while the FRBR entities are parts of a model of the bibliographic universe, “item” in AACR is an entity in a model of the rules themselves, the pragmatics of the system of information organization, the procedures that catalogers follow to describe the entities in the bibliographic universe.

It is true that “item” in this sense could be specified in terms of the FRBR entities. It could either be thought of as a manifestation (with occasional attributes relating to a specific item in the FRBR sense) or as an item in the FRBR sense described as an exemplar of a manifestation (these are simply two ways of saying the same thing; the second formulation simply recognizes that a cataloger bases the description of a manifestation on one or more exemplars, but never all exemplars of the manifestation). However, we would lose something important by failing to recognize in the language of our rules the distinction between the bibliographic entities and what the cataloger decides to describe — even when these correspond exactly, as they do in most cases. And there are some situations where they do not correspond exactly. An “item” in the AACR sense can be either a single manifestation, a collection of manifestations, or a manifestation of a part of a work, to use the formulation that Riva uses in some of her recommendations. [Note: in other parts of her proposals, she refers to a resource as a manifestation of a work, a collection of works, or parts of a work; in other words, the resource is a single manifestation regardless of what it contains; this latter language seems preferable.] It

is also true (unless we drastically change our normal way of working) that not all manifestations will be separately described. Therefore, there is a real, not just a conceptual, distinction between the AACR “item” and the FRBR “manifestation.”

The rules, as a set of procedural specifications, need a concept distinct from the FRBR entities that recognizes that these entities are not sufficient to describe how the cataloger determines the boundaries of what is being described in a bibliographic record. AACR, as Delsey perceived, uses “item” in this sense. In order to specify that the (AACR) item described is a manifestation of an expression of a work, we need a term for “item” distinct from the terms that are used to define the “item.”

As noted above, Delsey used “document” to refer to the real world counterpart of “item”; occasionally you need to refer to the raw physical stuff independent of the cataloger’s decision about what to describe. In the current text, “document” in this sense occurs only in the glossary definition of “item” and Riva’s proposed definition of “bibliographic resource” manages to do without the term. On the other hand, some of the instances of the term “material” that remain in the rules may have something to do with the same concept. (See our discussion of “material” below.)

Thus far, the argument has been for preserving the distinction between “item” in the AACR sense and the FRBR Type 2 entities. There are also some problems with the proposal to use “[bibliographic] resource” as a substitute. The term “bibliographic resource” was introduced into the glossary and to the terminology of the rules as part of a group of terms (electronic resource, continuing resource, integrating resource) that were used in the rules as names for “classes of materials.” While we have recognized that the concept of class of materials is fraught with difficulties, the concept still exists in the rules. Transforming a term that was designed to identify the broadest possible class of materials into a term that can replace “item” as that term has been used in AACR is a major change. While the essence of the definition of the AACR “item” concept is included in the proposed definition of “bibliographic resource” (... forming the basis for a single bibliographic description ...), it is possible that “bibliographic resource” still carries class-of-materials connotations that will inhibit a true understanding of the new concept. Unfortunately, Riva has rather thoroughly and convincingly eliminated all the apparent alternative terms. “[Bibliographic] resource” seems to work as a substitute for “item” — if the cataloger has a good understanding of that concept and reads it into the new term. That may be the best we can hope for.

To summarize, the concept currently termed “item” is needed as a distinct term for use in specifying the process by which the cataloger decides exactly what to describe in a bibliographic record. “[Bibliographic] resource” was defined in the rules as a class of materials, the connotations of that definition may not be consistent with using this term as a replacement for “item.”

But do we really need the “bibliographic resource” concept?

The case against “bibliographic resource.” The rationale for using “(bibliographic) resource” rather than “manifestation” is that FRBR lacks a term “for the ‘real world’ entity that is described as a unit in a single bibliographic record and which may

comprise one or more manifestations of one or more works” (p. 1). Riva appears to be unwilling to perform a one for one substitution of FRBR term “manifestation” for AACR term “item” because the FRBR definition of “manifestation” only applies to single entities and not aggregates and collections (of FRBR/AACR “works”), or, as one reader noted, component parts. In real world cataloging, treating an aggregate/collection as an “item,” i.e., “as a ‘handle’ to facilitate reference to the ‘real world’ entity that is the centre of focus for the bibliographic record” [Delsey quoted by Riva] is exceptional but not uncommon and FRBR term “manifestation” cannot account for it. Because “manifestation” as defined by FRBR does not appear to address adequately the real world situation, use of this key term tends to get lost in the AACR/FRBR exercise, effectively obscured by whatever substitute term for AACR “item” is employed (“document” or “bibliographic resource”).

JSC might consider whether it would be better to extend the definition of manifestation to include both single and multiple manifestations considered as a unit:

“Manifestation. A manifestation forms the basis for a bibliographic description and may be tangible or intangible. Generally, a manifestation is the physical embodiment of an expression of a work. In some situations, a manifestation may represent multiple expressions of multiple works, or multiple expressions of a single work, considered as a single physical embodiment.”

Surely there is no reason to follow FRBR terminology rigidly if the term is not globally adequate for real world cataloging, and if by doing so the key term and the concept it represents become largely absent in the text of the rules. The basic concept defined by FRBR term “manifestation” is sound, but unless it can be placed in the foreground, i.e., generally used as a substitute for current AACR term “item,” the logical hierarchy of Work→Expression→Manifestation will be weakened in the discourse of the rules and use of FRBR as a conceptual foundation will not be rhetorically persuasive. In the real world, if catalogers don’t encounter a key term/concept like “manifestation” whenever they consult the rules in those sections where the term might generally be expected to be employed, the concept will not take and may well undermine acceptance of its hierarchically superior term “expression.” Going from “manifestation” to “expression” by way of “bibliographic resource” could end up being a very roundabout and confusing way to express the FRBR hierarchy in the rules. The cost-benefit of introducing an intermediate concept like “bibliographic resource” into the terminological hierarchy must weigh gains in subtlety against excessive complexity of explanation. Further, an expanded definition of “manifestation” would coincide with FRBR in almost all cases, since AACR term “item” does refer to a single physical embodiment of an expression in most situations. To let the exception cases determine the use of terminology would be to let the tail wag the dog. Nor would a modified definition of “manifestation” in AACR in any way undermine FRBR. At best/worst this might serve eventually as feedback in a revision of the concept, or at least in a review of its limitations.

Note: Should the decision be to retain “bibliographic resource,” one suggestion has been to simplify the definition as “A manifestation of one or more works or parts of works, in any form ...” The idea behind the rephrasing is that it makes more sense to think of an aggregate as a manifestation of more than one work (or parts of works) than it is to think of an aggregate as made up of multiple manifestations. Also, in those sections of the text where the phrase “serial, integrating resource, or multipart monograph” is used, perhaps it would be possible to shorten to “multipart resource” or “multipart manifestation” although this might be considered a new concept or term requiring a definition.

- ✓ **Definition of “Item.”** Given commonly-used terminology and past history, JSC might consider including the word “copy” in this definition, i.e., “A single exemplar *or copy* of a manifestation.” This would allow for flexibility in using “copy” as a synonym for “item” in some rules. However, a case could be made for limiting to the one FRBR term for the sake of consistency.
- ✓ **Use of the term “material(s)” in the rules.** We acknowledge Riva’s decision to retain “materials” where that term is currently used in the text of the rules. However, as indicated above, there is some concern about how the term “material” is intended to be understood in the context of the FRBR/AACR exercise, and further revisions may be needed. It was noted that the term “material” was used when one might expect to see the term “(bibliographic) resource.” Is use of “material” rather than “(bibliographic) resource” intentional? One possible reading sees this as intended to focus on “class of material” in the context of the rule. On the other hand, since the term “material” is used most often in the generalized chapter 1 rules, it may be that “material” is an attempt to broaden the scope of the bibliographic entity being described beyond the conceptual universe delimited by FRBR terminology (with the understanding that the term “bibliographic resource” is intended to be limited to that conceptual universe). The FRBR hierarchy Work→Expression→Manifestation →Item is grounded on “work,” i.e., “a distinct intellectual or artistic creation.” (Or one traditionally perceived as such, e.g. certain religious works or epic narratives from ancient times.) It follows that the terminology used by FRBR has difficulties when the entity cataloged is not “a distinct intellectual or artistic creation” in itself but has that distinctiveness or unity superimposed upon it by the cataloger (or vendor!) for reasons that may be extrinsic to the document/objects/collection being cataloged. Whether or not this interpretation of “material” in the context of the exercise is correct, JSC does need to keep in mind that FRBR terminology may not always be appropriate when the rules have to be generalized to account for bibliographic entities that may not be based on works, for example, archival collections. JSC should consider whether adjustments in terminology are necessary in such cases and decide whether those adjustments should be articulated or implied. We would prefer that they be articulated.
- ✓ **“Edition” and “Edition Statement.”** The concept of edition appears in two different contexts in AACR. In Part I of the rules, “edition” is an attribute of the

manifestation, an “edition statement” transcribed from the prescribed sources in the manifestation. In Part II, “edition” has been used in a variety of contexts dealing with decisions about the boundaries of a particular bibliographic description (when to make a new record) and with relationships to different entities that need to be described through headings not only for works, but (in some cases) for specific “editions.”

In both Part I and II, the FRBR terminology proposals clearly bring out the fact that the AACR definition of “edition” does not cleanly map to either “expression” or “manifestation.” In specific cases, the term “edition” can refer to either an expression or a manifestation. In both cases, in an ideal world, it would be desirable to replace “edition” with “expression” or “manifestation” to make it clear which concept applies. However, in both cases, there are problems with simply doing this.

In the case of Part I, “edition” occurs in the context of the content of the description; we are actually including the term “edition” (or other terms that reference the concept of edition) in the descriptions that we create for our users. In that context, we need to work with the terminology that they are familiar with. “Edition” is a term with a long tradition of use in both publishing and scholarly contexts. While its meaning may not be consistent in all those contexts, we cannot simply redefine the term to suit our new conceptual framework. The CC:DA Task Force on Consistency across Part I has been trying to concentrate on rules for “edition statements” that do not reference the underlying concept of edition more than necessary. The basic rule is to transcribe an edition statement that appears in a manifestation, without asking whether what that statement refers to is a distinct expression or simply a named manifestation. The concept of edition, however, cannot be completely removed at this point because of ISBD elements such as “statement of responsibility relating to the edition” that make use of the concept. The result is not ideal, but may be the best we can do.

In the case of Part II, the term “edition” is being used in the rules, in instructions to catalogers, but the term itself does not (typically) appear in the resulting records. In that context, it is preferable to replace the concept of “edition” with either “expression” or “manifestation” in order to make clear which entity is being referred to in the rules. The FRBR proposals come very close to achieving this (particularly if option b at 25.2B is accepted).

In *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* care is taken in the glossary to ensure that “edition” is limited to manifestations; the term is retained to distinguish between different manifestations of the same expression issued by different entities. (However, it was noted that the definition does not allow for situations when an edition contains more than one manifestation.) It would seem that by default, “expression” would be expected to replace use of AACR “edition” when “edition” is not associated with FRBR “edition” as manifestation, but in practice this raises problems because “expression” can be imprecise in the context of the rules.

A noteworthy example of the problem caused by the imprecision of FRBR “expression” relative to AACR can be seen in the options for changing 25.2B (*4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* section Ch. 25, p. 2).

In Option a), 2nd sentence, “Relate editions” is retained because of the imprecision of FRBR “expression” in this context, since the rule is intended to apply only to sequential revised editions, and FRBR “expression” encompasses not just revised editions but also: abridgments/condensations/expurgations (the rule has already specifically excluded the expression subset *translations*). But *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* has redefined “edition” in the revised AACR glossary to a limited manifestation (limited by issuing entity), and in the context of the 25.2B rule “edition” is a subset of expression, so use of the term “edition” seems inappropriate.

In Option b), *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* emends “Relate editions” to “Relate such expressions,” which appears to be correct (given the revised definition of edition), but it assumes cataloger familiarity with the range of types of expressions which, as noted above, is not made explicit in the glossary.

It may be that because “expression” is understood to mean more than “edition as expression” (i.e. encompassing also translation, abridgment, etc.), Riva is sometimes reluctant to use “expression” when it would seem to be appropriate. This leads to the situation in the proposed amendment to 21.13C where Riva substitutes *version* for *edition*. Surely the object of incorporating new terminology from FRBR is not helped by introducing more new terminology from — where?

The difficulties demonstrate how the conceptual schemes of the FRBR principles and AACR are difficult to get in synch. Why couldn’t the emendation have been something like “If the chief source of information presents the manifestation as an expression of the original work, enter it as such”?

To justify use of “expression” in 25.2B, one could argue that, *in the context of the rule*, the cataloger is not going to apply the rule to a *translation* of the original work. It may be that reasoning from context is considered to be a little suspect, hence the options presented. But if reasoning from context is suspect, then there may be a problem with this aspect of FRBR incorporation. Given that in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2*, “edition” has been redefined and limited to being a subset of manifestation,

- a. The glossary would appear to need a definition for *edition statement* since the edition statement can refer to both/either manifestation and expression sets. However, one reader strongly believes in not defining “edition statement” and leaving the basic instruction at 1.2B1 deliberately vague, since any attempt to define “edition statement” must deal with the concept of “edition” itself, and it may be impossible to do so cleanly using FRBR terminology. It follows from this position that the proposed updates to the definition of “edition” for books, electronic resources, other materials, and unpublished material, which focus on *manifestation*, may need to be reexamined, or even eliminated, as suggested below.
- b. There now appears to be no functional term for edition *as expression*, i.e. the subset of expression that usually does not include translations. As the exercise has shown, there are going to be situations where only that subset is referred

to. Coming up with such a term may not be necessary if JSC is comfortable with substituting “expression” for “edition” where appropriate in Part II, at the cost of some loss of precision, and letting context define the meaning.

No specific recommendation is being made. If JSC decides that correct understanding of expression can be determined in the context of a given rule, then perhaps the document should use “expression” more freely instead of “edition.” As with “manifestation,” if the term “expression” isn’t used frequently in the rules, it seems reasonable that catalogers will have a hard time absorbing a working understanding of the concept. If JSC decides that the precise implication of expression must be brought out at rule specific level, then expression should still be used, with a qualifier, e.g. “edition as expression.” If a qualifier is used, some definition of “edition as expression” would need to be added to the glossary.

Finally, Tom Delsey suggested merging the four variant definitions of edition into a single definition that was not restricted by class of materials. JSC endorsed that concept. We would like to see this done, either as part of the FRBR terminology proposal, or as a separate proposal. The basic definition would seem to be:

“Edition. All items produced from the same master copy and issued by the same entity. See also Facsimile reproduction, Impression, Issue, Reprint.”

This definition fails to deal with a number of issues that deserve further discussion:

(a) Is “issued by the same entity” an essential part of the definition? It is clearly not related to “expression” but only to “manifestation.” As used by scholars, it is not clear that edition is normally interpreted to include conditions of issuance. (b) Does “A change in distributor does not mean a change of edition” apply only to “other materials”? Is it an essential part of the definition for any class of materials? (c) Does the basic definition apply adequately to unpublished materials without the specific language included in that definition?

- ✓ **Definitions for “Facsimile reproduction” and “Reprint.”** There was general agreement that “equivalent manifestation” in the definition is not needed. *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* does not seem to have a rationale for introducing this concept, and it may not be true in all cases. There is concern too that the second sentence is basically telling libraries how to interpret and process such a reproduction and seems inappropriate in a glossary. If the interpolated sentence is retained, there is also objection to the phrase “of a *single* expression of a work” since a reprint publication could embody multiple expressions.

The last two definition concerns hinge on the concept of responsibility:

- ✓ **Definitions for “Mixed responsibility” and “Shared responsibility.”** Responsibility can also be for an expression (e.g. a performance) and perhaps for a manifestation. Should the definitions extend beyond the “work?”

- ✓ **Definition of “Statement of responsibility.”** Statements of responsibility are not confined to responsibility for the work, and responsibility for the expression is not confined to performance.
- ✓ **Reorganizing chapter 21.** ALA agrees that “to fully incorporate FRBR concepts into chapter 21 would require a major reorganization of the chapter and much additional material to relate the main entry heading and added entries to the level of entity to which they apply.” Assuming that JSC plans to review chapter 21 in any case, ALA at this time does not see any strong reason to exclude the FRBR conceptual framework from the chapter 21 reorganization, although practical considerations may limit full reconciliation. The emphasis on relationships and expressing main entry as citation practice for the primary work in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* is consistent with FRBR and demonstrates how incorporation of its conceptual scheme could have a salutary effect in rethinking (or re-expressing) the rules in terms of online catalogs.

As an instance of the potential impact on cataloging workflow, and of the practical considerations involved with incorporating the FRBR conceptual scheme, consider 21.6C1, where the logic of relationships and the citation concept suggest an interesting rule revision. The question is, if all bibliographic relationships do not need to be brought out or cannot be (and pragmatically this would seem to be the case), do the rules need to be up front about when the relationships need to be made explicit? If making the relationships explicit is considered to be a purely local decision, wouldn't that subvert (to a trivial or non-trivial extent?) the proposed reconceptualization of the rules for chapter 21 as headings and relationships? This is not a criticism of the document as it stands, but a reference to what ought to be considered if chapter 21 is reorganized.

It was noted also that the FRBR terminology proposals did not address the outdated use of the term “entry” or the need to re-conceptualize main entry as citation practice in the text of the rules and the glossary. The Format Variation Working Group will be dealing with a part of this, and the revision of Chapter 21 will deal with other parts. However, it might be worth considering even now how to revise the glossary definition and rule 20.1. The revision below was suggested as one possibility, although not all the reviewers supported it:

~~**Entry.** A record of an item in a catalogue. *See also* Heading. [The term may no longer be necessary.]~~

~~**Main entry.** The complete catalogue record of an item, presented in the form by which the entity is to be uniformly identified and cited. The main entry may include the tracing(s) (q.v.). The initial element of the citation of a work. *See also* Added entry.~~

[**Comment.** If “main entry” continues to be used, is it to be considered as synonymous with “citation” (author/title in certain cases) or as a distinct element of the citation, as the revised definition implies?]

20.1. When a standard description for a bibliographic resource ~~an item~~ has been created ~~established~~ according to the rules in part I, assign ~~add~~ headings and/or uniform titles <or just “headings?”> to that description to create a bibliographic record ~~catalogue entries~~. ~~The only exception is when an entry is made under title proper, in which case the entry may be made under the first words of the description. In this connection, see also 0.6.~~
 [2nd paragraph as in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2*]

Refocusing on entity relationships in chapter 21 may have an impact on the proposed chapter on authority control and it may be a substantial effort to keep those chapters in synch. On the positive side, it may be helpful to move some of the entity relationship concepts from chapter 21 to an authority control chapter, or at least make this an option, e.g. 21.5A, paragraph 2, or 21.4D.

- ✓ **“Represents” vs. “Embodies.”** In 25.5C1, *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2* we see something of a struggle to find the right verb to indicate the relationship between a resource and the expression it contains (“represents” in the terminology of the document). Why not use the FRBR relationship terminology: a bibliographic resource is a manifestation and a manifestation *embodies* an expression of a work? There are probably other instances in the rules where the FRBR term “embodies” would be appropriate. Incidentally, retaining use of the term “edition” in 25.5C1 seems a little questionable in light of the ambiguities associated with the term as noted above.
- ✓ **Chapter 25 in general.** Review of the proposed changes to chapter 25 should probably be postponed until the recommendations of the Format Variations Working Group have been issued.

We commend Pat Riva for producing such a thorough and thought-provoking set of proposals. In most cases, we agree with her recommendations; we always found her analysis of the issues to be incisive and took them as our point of departure, even when disagreeing with some of her conclusions. We note the complexity and significance of these issues. We would like to see them resolved as quickly as possible, but we feel it is even more important that these issues be resolved in the right way. The decisions made in this context will be tremendously influential on the conceptual and practical foundations of Anglo-American cataloging for a long time. We need to get this right.

Appendix

Chapter 1 in general and in specifics: Where 4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2 proposes revisions to the text of Chapter 1, it complements the work of the ALA Task Force on Consistency Across Part I of AACR2. We agree with Pat Riva that decisions on Chapter 1 should be made before revisions to Chapters 2-12 are proposed. Since the ALA Task Force will also be proposing revisions to these chapters, it seems a fair division of labor (and avoids conflicting proposals) for the revisions to Chapter 1, as modified and approved by JSC, to be carried across the other chapters by the ALA Task Force. We recommend that JSC give priority to making decisions on Chapter 1, so that the process can begin this fall. To that end, we offer the following specific suggestions, a few of which have nothing to do with FRBR terminology, but which will need to be addressed by the task force.

1.0D: The phrase “material being described” is retained, although other instances have been revised to “resource being described;” we recommend that this rule be revised as well.

1.0H1c): The proposal is to change “item” here to “material”; we find this solution undesirable, for all the reasons given by Riva (connotations of physical format), but have no alternative to propose.

1.1A1: The phrase “the chief source of information for the material to which the bibliographic resource belongs” uses “material” in a way that seems to refer to the class-of-materials concept. Until that concept is removed from the rules, we suggest being explicit about it: “the chief source of information appropriate to the class of materials to which the bibliographic resource belongs”.

1.1B9: Riva goes to considerable effort to avoid saying that resources contain works, insisting that resources contain manifestations of works. [As an aside, we suggest above that she might consider saying that resources “embody” works.] There are several examples of this language in Chapter 1, but 1.1B9 seems the most convoluted. Elsewhere (at 21.4A1), she proposes “Enter any manifestation of a work, a collection of works, or selections from a work or works ...” rather than “Enter any manifestation of a work, a collection of manifestations of works, or manifestations of selections from a work or works ...” The broader use of “manifestation” to include collections and parts is much clearer, and is conceptually consistent with the FRBR concept of manifestation.

1.1C3: The phrase “manifestation in one material” retains the term “material”; “format” might be a better alternative here.

1.1C3: The term “reproduction” is one that ALA has for some time found valuable. We would hate to lose it. Perhaps “Reproduction” could be defined as “a manifestation in

one format of an expression of a work originally presented in another format” and retain the term “reproduction” in this rule.

1.1G1: This wording could be simplified: “If, in a resource lacking a collective title, one constituent part is predominant, treat the title of that part as the title proper and name the other part(s) in a contents note (see 1.7B18).”

1.1G3: Similarly, the second paragraph wording could be simplified: “Separate the titles of the constituent parts by semicolons if the part(s) are all by the same person(s) ... Follow the title of each part by its parallel title(s) ...”

1.1G4: And: “If, in a resource lacking a collective title, more than one (but not all) of the separately titled parts predominate, treat the predominating parts as instructed in 1.1G3, and name the other part(s) in contents notes (see 1.7B18).”

1.2B1: Is there a sense of when AACR uses the definite article and when the indefinite? This rule seems better phrased as “Transcribe an edition statement ...” rather than “Transcribe the edition statement ...”

1.5B: The change from “extent of item” to “statement of extent” is a good one. One minor point is that 1.5B1 uses the phrase “number of physical units”; in this context, “units” is too easily confused with units of measurement; it might be better to say “number of physical pieces”; “pieces” is used in this sense in 1.10.

1.5B5: The final phrase about blank spaces before the SMD should be deleted, if that was not done in the final editorial changes for the 2002 revision.

1.7B4: The effort required to avoid saying that only works have titles may not be worthwhile. It may not even be true. Is not title an attribute of work, expression and manifestation — and even item (a binder’s title)? Is this rule only dealing with titles that apply to the work and, if so, does the language need to be that explicit?

1.7B16: We agree that the final paragraph is not appropriate and should be deleted.

1.9: Riva points out that “Supplementary Items” should be “Supplementary works” because the supplement relationship is between works; on the other hand, only manifestations of works can be described, so in part I we have to deal with manifestations. Technically, the correct caption for 1.9 should be “Manifestations of Supplementary Works.”