

To: ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Task Force on FRBR Terminology

RE: Response to *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4* and
Part II of *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/2*

General Considerations

A continuing concern of some of the Task Force members is the question of use of the terms item/manifestation/bibliographic resource. Not all members agree on the need to discuss this further. However, we think it would be useful

- a) if CC:DA expresses some concern about the relationship of the term “bibliographic resource” to the FRBR terms since that relationship has not been clarified,
- b) that CC:DA state that it expects the revised draft Introduction will endeavor to clarify that relationship,
- c) that CC:DA reserves judgment until the revised Introduction is available, with the understanding that, in general, use of the FRBR terminology in Pat’s revision should be considered provisional until there is a consensus on the exposition provided in the Introduction.

The concern, as expressed in paragraph 2, p. 1, is that some feel that “bibliographic resource” is superfluous and confusing. In the Glossary it is defined in terms of “manifestation” or “set of manifestations”. Even if not all agree that introduction of the term is not useful, the Introduction needs to address those concerns with a clearer explanation of why the term should be applied. If the explanation is unsatisfactory, that would be the time to address whether it is appropriate. Although Pat’s document and Task Force discussion have offered various rationales for the term, our different understandings about how FRBR is consistent with or at odds with cataloging as we know it have made it difficult to come to consensus. We are hoping that the Introduction can provide a clearer idea of that relationship and whether the use of intermediary terminology like “bibliographic resource” is necessary. We believe that having an official position in the Introduction stating what FRBR means to cataloging and how FRBR terminology relates to familiar cataloging concepts may help us out of this impasse.

The General Introduction should clarify the use of the FRBR Type 1 entities in the rules. The glossary and the text of the rules are not the right places to make explicit the relationships between the various entities. As we understand Pat Riva’s rationale for the term “bibliographic resource,” FRBR terms are somewhat inadequate in accounting for decisions made prior to cataloging. The exact entity that is described in any given bibliographic record is the result of making certain decisions before one begins to catalog. One of those decisions involves whether the manifestation being cataloged has

already been described in a bibliographic record, and, if not, does the manifestation exhibit major differences from other manifestations already described. (In other words, one may have a distinct manifestation, but choose not to create a new record if the differences are minor). Decision on the level of analysis is also needed. If the manifestation is a volume in a monographic series, will the manifestation be described individually, or will it be used as the basis for the description of the serial as a whole? Other decisions are also required. The result of these decisions is an abstract entity created by the cataloger. The draft Introduction should also clarify that AACR has used the term “item” previously in a number of different senses than the FRBR “item.” The Introduction should indicate the contexts in which the AACR “item” was used and what alternate terminology will be used when the FRBR “item” is inappropriate.” Past uses in AACR include the meanings of physical form, expression, work, and single exemplar.

In our earlier response, we also called attention to the use of the term “material.” The revised draft Introduction would do well to explain how this term is being applied, especially when it is frequently substituted for AACR “item” (e.g. 0.9, 0.27, 0.29, 1.0A2, 1.0D, 1.4C8, 1.4D8 especially). Clarification also is needed since “class of material” does not seem to be the same as the general use of “material(s)”. If the intention is to have “material” function as a shortened “class of materials”, this might be very confusing. We also question whether “materials” is sometimes intended to be used in contrast to “bibliographic resources,” as in “unpublished materials.”

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Only those proposed revisions on which we have specific comments or recommendations for changes are mentioned:

- ✓ 0.24: it ought to be possible to find more informative language than “the class of material to which the bibliographic resource being cataloged belongs”; the revisions of the introductions should look more closely at this rule and its attempt to capture the way in which the chapters in Part I are to be applied.
- ✓ 0.25: it might be better to say “give details relating to the cartographic or electronic class of materials”. In addition, as part of the consistency revisions for Area 3, CC:DA has proposed to delete rule 0.25
- ✓ 0.27: why is “material” preferred here to “bibliographic resource”?
- ✓ 0.29 a): “bibliographic resources” would be better

Chapter I:

- ✓ 1.0A1: there is a wish that we could dispense with the “class of materials” concept

- ✓ 1.0D: “bibliographic resources” preferred to “material” based on preference at 0.29
- ✓ 1.0D3: the same concern about “class of material”
- ✓ 1.0H2: is it going too far to extend a rule written for multipart items/monographs to continuing resources?
- ✓ 1.1B3: could the FRBR term “work” be used? The justification for not doing so is unclear.
- ✓ 1.1B3: some members ask if rather than introducing a new term, why couldn’t “manifestation, expression, or work” be substituted for “item” if that is what the term implies in this context? If the object is to get the cataloger to re-think cataloging on the basis of the FRBR hierarchy, using the terms at this point would help to reinforce this; here using a non-FRBR term may be a little off point.
- ✓ 1.1C2: might be better as “If a bibliographic resource is in a format falling within ...”
- ✓ 1.1C4: “If a bibliographic resource contains parts belonging to classes of material falling into ...” (although a better phrase than “classes of materials” would be welcome, as noted above.
- ✓ 1.1F12: is one place where we were given the “Existing rule” and no change was provided (see also, e.g., C2A2). Were these to indicate retention of “work”?
- ✓ 1.1G1: there is no compelling need to repeat “constituent” before the 2nd and 3rd uses of the term “part”
- ✓ 1.1G2: same comment on repeating “constituent”
- ✓ 1.1G3: same comment; it is really apparent and excessive here
- ✓ 1.1G4: same comment
- ✓ 1.2: agree with analysis, but sometimes the term “edition” in the rules (e.g., 1.2D) does refer to the concept of edition, not to the edition statement.
- ✓ 1.2C1: the ALA consistency proposal for 1.2C1 has much more to say about this rule, and not all of the CC:DA members agreed with Pat that “work” is the correct term here, although some do.
- ✓ 1.2D1: Pat’s point that these statements identify expressions indicates how the ISBD might be revised to remove “edition” from the name of this element. In 1.2D1 and in some other cases, where “edition” means “expression”, we could replace one word with the other. However, even if the only occurrence of the

word “edition” left in AACR were in “edition statement”, the word “edition” cannot currently be omitted because it occurs in the names of ISBD elements. Although the ISBDs are outside the scope of this document, we recommend that the ISBD Review Group be contacted to see if “edition” can be changed or clarified within the ISBDs.

- ✓ 1.4C8: did Pat indicate why she chose the singular for “material”?
- ✓ 1.5B1: would be better as “class of material” (although, again, another phrase would be preferred)
- ✓ 1.5B5: some members prefer “multipart resource”; another the “multipart manifestation”.
- ✓ 1.6G2: replace “periodical” series with “For numbering of a serial”
- ✓ 1.7B2: use “expression” instead of bibliographic resource
- ✓ 1.7B4, 7: the Consistency TF will note the comments when it gets to the review of Area 7
- ✓ 1.7B20: one member questions whether retaining “copy” here might not be wise, given the previous use of “item” in the rules, but not all agree.
- ✓ 1.7B21: isn’t this a different use of “constituent parts” than in 1.1G? Perhaps it would be better to use “component” or simply “part”.
- ✓ 1.7B23: to parallel the rule, the header should be “Issue, iteration, or part described
- ✓ 1.8D1: not repeat “bibliographic” in the second instance
- ✓ 1.10A: “distinct classes of materials”, or “different formats” to parallel the usage at 1.5A3
- ✓ 1.11A: in the first paragraph, it should be “that” instead of “which”; also “class of material” in the 3rd paragraph, or “If a facsimile, etc., is in a different format from that of the original manifestation ...”
- ✓ Was “manifestation” intentionally retained from the earlier draft, in 1.5A3, 1.5B5, 1.7A4, 1.7B16, 1.7B22, 1.11A, 1.11B, 1.11C, 1.11D, 1.11E, 1.11F, 13.3A, definition of Game in glossary, or should “bibliographic resource” have been used instead? “Manifestation” seems to work pretty well.
- ✓ There is a question of the substitution of “constituent part” for AACR “works” (e.g. 1.0H1, 1.1B10, 1.1G1, 1.1G2, 1.1G3, 1.1G4) at 13.2A, use “If, in a comprehensive entry for a larger part, a smaller part is named either in ...”

Appendix D, Glossary

- ✓ One TF member commented that some terms that were not defined as fully or as unambiguously in the glossary (if defined at all) as they are employed in the text include: item, material, work, text, part, multimedia item. This member thinks that rewording the text of AACR in the light of more explicit definitions might help in then replacing terminology with FRBR terminology.
- ✓ Pat's draft definition of "equivalent manifestation" has proposed text that is only applicable to textual material and is, therefore, inadequate. We suggest the definition of "reproductions" in ALA's *Guidelines for the Bibliographic Description of Reproductions* be consulted for more general language that makes some of the same points. Also, "equivalent manifestation" is not an FRBR term.

Comments on specific terms in the Glossary:

Bibliographic resource: "forming the basis for a single bibliographic description" — elsewhere Pat uses the term "bibliographic record" for what seems to be the same thing. Is there a distinction that needs to be made between "description" and "record"? If not, one or the other should be used consistently.

Edition (all variations), impression, issue: One member thinks that the definitions of these concepts in terms of "all copies ..." is well established in the bibliographic literature. This is a case in which that member would use the synonym established in the definition of "item" and retain the word "copies". Another member thinks that synonyms should not be used instead of the "preferred" term, and, therefore, "item" is correct.

Edition (Pat's remark on p. 3): The proposed definition may be the best we can do. We agree that the definition does not apply well to unpublished material, but then neither does the concept of edition; we simply use the edition statement to transcribe terms identifying a version of the resource. In other words, the term "edition statement" once again needs to be disconnected from the concept of "edition". We probably are not really applying the concept of edition to electronic resources or unpublished material; we are simply transcribing what we choose to call edition statements. Eventually we may not need the concept of edition in the rules at all, but for now (as I said) I think this is the best we can do.

Edition (unpublished materials). Perhaps the concept could be applied to unpublished materials/resources. What about a set of copies of an early version of a play labeled "1st draft" or the like, or video copies of a rough cut of a motion picture?

Entry: Note that 4JSC/CCC/9 addresses this definition and is probably the direction we would want to go, rather than retaining the concept of entry as record.

Game: One member asks why is this a “manifestation” rather than a “resource”? Also, Pat is correct that the revised definition does not convey the sense that a game may consist of one or more pieces. If that is indeed a necessary part of the definition, the definition needs further revision.

Impression: “which were” isn’t necessary. If left it, it should be “that were”

Item: Pat makes a good point about the ambiguity of “copy”; however, ALA’s original comment was more concerned with the fact that “copy” has been used — both in the rules, in bibliographic scholarship, and in common usage — to mean a single exemplar. I think we continue to find this usage more significant than the ambiguity of “copy” as “reproduction”.

Main entry: Again, 4JSC/CCC/9 is relevant and is the direction we want to go.

Mixed responsibility: The definitions of “mixed” and “shared” responsibility are phrased very differently. While we are working on this, let’s clean it up.
Suggested is:

Mixed responsibility. Collaboration between two or more persons or bodies performing different kinds of activities (e.g., adapting or illustrating a work written by another person) in the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a bibliographic resource. See also Joint author, Shared responsibility.

Numbering: “successive parts” — in other places, we use “issues, iterations, or parts” to cover serials, integrating resources, and multipart monographs respectively; since numbering does not normally apply to integrating resources (so the rule says), perhaps this should be “successive issues or parts”.

Publisher’s number (Music): Since this definition (like that of “Plate number (Music)”) is restricted to printed music, the same phrasing should be used: “... assigned to printed music ...”

Title: “or the work contained in it” —Does this need to be “work(s)”?

Part II

General comment. What seems to make “manifestation” more palatable in part II is that it is used in situations requiring comparison. However, the reasons why “manifestation” is far more acceptable in part II would be worth fleshing out, either in the Introduction to part II or the General introduction. In other words, if the Introduction is going to explain the limitations of FRBR terms in descriptive cataloging (including supplementary terminology), it would be very helpful if it is also stated how FRBR concepts serve to

clarify and organize part II in terms of bibliographic relationships (of which comparison is one aspect).

Chapter 21:

The particular question that JSC wanted us to comment on is Pat's recommendations on how far to rewrite rules that use the term "edition" in Part 2. Those points are the ones commented on below; most of the rest is simple substitution of terms based on a few basic decisions.

- ✓ 21.1B1: This rule ought to apply in some cases to expressions (as may have been implied in the original wording), but maybe using "manifestations" actually makes it more flexible. In a way that is somewhat analogous to "edition statements," one doesn't need to agonize over whether something is really a different expression; you make the decision about creating a new bibliographic record (or description) based on the wording on the physical entity. The revised rule is able to account for both genuine expression changes and simultaneously or subsequently published manifestations of the same expression. The same logic would apply to 21.6C.
- ✓ 21.2B1: We agree with Pat's use of the term manifestation here. On the other hand, Tom Delsey noted that this rule leads to inconsistent citations for editions of the same work, and Pat notes that without a uniform title, this rule does not provide collocation of works. The revision of Chapter 21 should address these issues.
- ✓ 21.2C, etc.: Agree generally with the replacement of "make a new entry" by "create a new bibliographic record" — although it still isn't clear whether "record" is better than "description". There could be some situations where a separate partial description might be made but not a separate record, but generally it seems "create a new bibliographic record" (or "description") seems more straightforward
- ✓ 21.3A1: "a manifestation that has been" not "which"; also perhaps it would read better if it read "manifestations of the work were entered in its ..."
- ✓ 21.6C: Agree that "edition" should be changed to "manifestation" here.
- ✓ 21.8A1: Agree that mixed responsibility applies to expressions as well as to works.
- ✓ 21.12A: Relating revisions to FRBR is a bit complicated, but agree with the proposed revision.
- ✓ 21.13C & D: The introduction of the term "version" here is to be regretted, as it doesn't mean much. However, Pat is correct that "manifestation" is not always

correct. Perhaps it might be better to avoid the problem altogether, and make the contrast between “Original work emphasized” and “Commentary emphasized” — “commentary or original work” for short.

- ✓ There is a case for retaining “edition” as justifiable based on long-standing usage by scholars in this particular context. If one has to introduce a term from left field in order to make the language more FRBR friendly, it is a sign that this may be a dubious “improvement.” By all means use “manifestation” or “expression” where appropriate, but this won’t make “edition” go away in common and scholarly usage. Maybe the new AACR Introduction also needs to relate the FRBR terminology to AACR “edition.” One could refer also to the comment on 1.2D1 in this response and Pat’s comment on 25.3C1, as well as to the rationale for retaining “item” in 25.13B in this response (although in that case perhaps some sort of qualifier on “item” might be necessary).
- ✓ 21.14A: “Each translation constitutes a new expression of the work” is the sort of explanatory text that JSC has usually been reluctant to include in the rules. It doesn’t seem to be necessary here, and 25.5C is probably a better place to make this point, or it could be moved to the AACR Introduction.
- ✓ 21.19A1: The recommendation to include the alternative rule for librettos here seems reasonable.
- ✓ 21.28: The proposal to rename this rule “Bibliographic Relationships” seems to make sense, until one realizes that the entire chapter is about establishing relationships among persons and bodies and the works, expressions and manifestations for which they are responsible — as well as between works and other works, works and expressions, etc. etc. This is also why identifying some added entries in the rules as “relationship added entries” isn’t quite correct: ALL entries, main or added, are about relationships — even analytical entries.
- ✓ 21.28-21.30 contain some significant revisions to clarify the types of relationships involved. Their proposals look reasonable, but deserve more extensive analysis — which they are likely to get during the review of Chapter 21. The rest of the chapter only contains simple substitutions of terms in a pattern already established and already commented upon.

Chapter 22: There really is only one issue here. Agree with the proposal to use “manifestations of works” throughout.

Chapter 24: Again, there is only the same issue to deal with. While “bibliographic resources” may be used throughout, “manifestations of works issued by the body ...” is not incorrect and would be consistent with the terminology proposed for Chapter 22.

Chapter 25 is tricky to comment on, since the FVWG proposals also deal with the same rules. Comment will be on both, usually noting that the FVWG proposal deals with the same rule and (usually) in a better way.

- ✓ 25.1A: Agree that “expressions” need to be added to “manifestations” here; however, the FVWG proposal does this more elegantly.
- ✓ 25.2B: The FVWG proposes to delete this rule; i.e., to make uniform titles applicable to revised editions. This was, we believe, a recommendation from Tom Delsey and a good idea in any case. If the rule is retained, we would prefer Pat’s option b — we generally would like to see this chapter written in terms of expressions and/or manifestations and eliminating the concept of edition whenever possible.
- ✓ 25.3C: Agree with the addition of “first” when talking about simultaneous publications.
- ✓ 25.5A: Pat proposes a simple change to distinguish between rules for identifying expressions and those for identifying manifestations. The FVWG proposal does the same thing in greater detail and should be the basis for discussion of this rule.
- ✓ 25.13B: Pat proposes to change “a single item within a collection” to “a single section within a collection” and “the item” to “the manuscript”. Use of the term “item” in archival and manuscript practice is well established — “item-level cataloging” as opposed to “collection-level cataloging” for example. For unpublished material, the FRBR bibliographic entities tend to merge together, as each item is a unique manifestation of a unique expression of a unique work. We think that “item” should continue to be used in this rule. Will the Introduction have to account not just for the AACR definition of “item” but also archival and manuscript practice?
- ✓ 25.35A1: The proposed revision here should be parallel to that at 25.5A, and the language proposed in the FVWG proposal should be used here, with suitable modifications.
- ✓ Chapter 26: In general, we like the addition of “expression” and the replacement of “catalogued” by “entered” throughout.

Attachment

One member of the Task Force felt the TF document does not represent her concerns adequately. Some of her points include.

In support of Pat Riva's position on the existence of four meanings of "item" in part 1, this member lists an additional function of "item" in AACR as serving as a "placeholder" term that allows a cataloger to handle (or implies that the cataloger may handle) any type of "future" phenomenon without having the cataloger needing to know, or "classify" the "thing".

This TF member also suggests using "item" in AACR in both the FRBR sense and in those situations where the rules need open-ended language using open-ended/undefined terms or a term that responds more to piece in hand and circumstances within an individual cataloging agency's policies.