

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/LC response*

Background

At the April 2003 JSC meeting, the general directions expressed in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/LC response* were endorsed, and all constituencies were asked to provide responses to this document.

The CC:DA Task Force on FRBR Terminology has reviewed this document, to the extent possible in the brief time available. We offer the following comments on the framework for using FRBR terminology offered by LC, as well as on some of the specifics (particularly those regarding Glossary definitions). We have not reviewed each of the rules in which LC proposes use of particular terms. We assume that there will be ample opportunity to do so in the two “next steps” noted below.

Because the LC response does not include all of the terms in the Glossary and because ALA has not commented on *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4*, the Glossary comments below include some comments on terms not included in the LC response.

Recommendations and Comments

Next steps: Discussion of the use of FRBR terminology needs to continue. This is particularly true because LC did not provide the actual text for many of the rules listed in their document. JSC seems to have determined two different, but related, paths forward:

1. The JSC Secretary has been asked to prepare a follow-up to *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4* which will provide the actual texts based on the principles in the LC response and other JSC decisions. All constituents should be encouraged to respond to the details contained in this document.
2. The ALA/CC:DA Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR has been asked to incorporate texts based on the JSC decisions in their proposals. Until JSC has made definite decisions, these proposals may differ somewhat from the *Secretary follow-up* and constituency responses may wish to include comments on the use of FRBR terminology.

General framework for use of FRBR terminology:

- ✓ LC suggests reserving “**bibliographic resource**” to be a more generic term. In general, we agree. However, the Task Force has previously indicated its concerns about the need to include information in the General Introduction covering the use of this term, its broader context, and its relation to the FRBR Type 1 terms. Most of the Task Force members provisionally support the simplified definition of “bibliographic resource” in the Glossary, but feel that this definition does not provide sufficient context for understanding the rather carefully-constructed framework of terminology that is being suggested or even justify the need for this term. The Task Force feels that this explanatory section of the General Introduction is a critical component to the successful incorporation of FRBR terminology in AACR and that final decisions cannot be made without having that text available for review.
- ✓ LC suggests using “**expression**” in place of “edition” when the term reflects a change in intellectual or artistic content. The Task Force agrees, but notes that “edition” is not always used in this sense in AACR and that something needs to be done about cases in which “edition” does or might mean “manifestation.” The Task Force also notes below that “edition” is an established term in the world of scholarship and publishing and that AACR probably cannot avoid acknowledging this fact.
- ✓ LC suggests using “**manifestation**” when dealing with an attribute of a manifestation or with attributes that would apply to all copies. The Task Force agrees, but notes that attributes of a *manifestation* may be statements transcribed from an *item* and such statements may present information relating to a *work* or *expression*. These terms are very closely interrelated; while it may be possible to develop consistent practices for using the terms in the rules, the terms need to be understood in conjunction with one another.
- ✓ LC suggests using “**item**” in instructions to transcribe information or otherwise give information as found in a source. The Task Force prefers the ACOC suggestion to delete the phrase containing the word “item” whenever possible, as specified in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/ACOC response*. In cases in which this is not possible, most of the Task Force provisionally support the LC proposal. However, we note that, in many cases, an instruction to transcribe from the particular item (copy) is based on the assumption that the information transcribed is an attribute of a manifestation and is applicable to, and appears on, all copies of the manifestation. The proposed use of the term “item,” although technically correct, omits existing contextual meanings present in AACR and therefore obscures the representational aspect of transcribed data; once again, this is part of the context of usage that needs to be explained carefully in the General Introduction. LC’s proposed revision to the definition of *statement of*

responsibility in the Glossary, noted below, is a good example of how transcription relates in different ways to both *item* and *manifestation*.

- ✓ LC suggests that “**material**” be limited to the distinction between published and unpublished material. The Task Force agrees.
- ✓ LC suggests that “**component**” is preferable to “constituent” in rules for collections. The Task Force agrees.
- ✓ LC suggests various revisions to the rules for “**supplements.**” The Task Force agrees with these revisions.
- ✓ LC suggests using “at hand” instead of “in hand” in order to avoid the implication of physicality. Some Task Force members agree, but all of us suspect that most catalogers will neither notice nor understand the difference.

Glossary definitions (Unless otherwise noted, the Task Force agrees with 4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4, as amended by the LC response.)

- ✓ *Bibliographic resource*: The Task Force noted above that LC’s proposed definition is so simple and generic that it conveys little of the rich context in which it needs to be understood. Without an explanation of this broader context in the General Introduction, this definition is inadequate. The Task Force further notes the use of the phrase “bibliographic description” in this definition. In April, JSC noted the need to distinguish between the *bibliographic description* and the *bibliographic record* in which the description resides. The Task Force strongly endorses the importance of this distinction.
- ✓ *Edition* (remark on p. 3 of 4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4): The proposed definition may be the best we can do. The Task Force agrees 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 we think this is the best we can do.

On the other hand, the Task Force does not agree with LC’s proposal to delete the definition of *edition* from the Glossary. It is not yet clear that we can dispense completely with the concept, either in the rules for Area 2 in part 1, in the rules for choice of entry in part 2, or in the guidelines on when to create a new description. Even if we could state our rules without recourse to the concept of *edition*, it would not be wise to do so. The concept is so entrenched, both in publishing practices and in bibliographic scholarship, that our failure to

acknowledge the concept, and to relate our rules to the intellectual constructs the concept supports, is a violation of the principle of user convenience.

- ✓ *Impression*: “which were” isn’t necessary; if left in, 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. Most Task Force members agree with the LC response, and wish to retain “copy” as an acceptable synonym for “item” when “item” cannot be used: one can’t refer to an *item* of a *manifestation* of an *expression* of a *work* without doing considerable violence to the English language. Furthermore, the term “copy” is a traditional and significant component of the definitions of *edition*, *impression*, and *issue* (“All copies ...”). Some Task Force members are reluctant to sanction the use of synonyms for FRBR terms, even when supported by tradition. If AACR does sanction the use of synonyms such as “copy,” it is critical that their usage and context be thoroughly explained in the General Introduction.
- ✓ *Mixed responsibility*: The definitions of “mixed” and “shared” responsibility are phrased very differently. The Task Force suggests that this should be made more consistent. 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 ...”
- ✓ *Statement of responsibility*: (a) According to LC’s own framework, one transcribes from the **item**, not the manifestation; therefore “transcribed from the item” should stand. This is a perfect example of language talking about the transcription from the item of an attribute of a manifestation. LC suggested using “item” in such cases, and the Task Force noted above the need for the General Introduction to provide an explanation of the context in which these terms are used. (b) One Task Force member points out that, according to FRBR, the intellectual or artistic content is “realized in the expression,” not “embodied in the manifestation.” To the extent that a statement of responsibility relates to the

content, it **must** relate to an expression. The *statement* is an attribute of the manifestation, but the *responsibility* relates to the expression. Since the language in the definition refers to the responsibility rather than the statement, “realized in the expression” should be used. (c) The Task Force agrees that “of the item” at the end of the definition should be deleted.

The following text embodies the comments above:

Statement of responsibility. A statement, transcribed from the item being described, relating to persons with responsibility ~~responsible~~ for the intellectual or artistic content realized in the expression ~~of the item~~, to corporate bodies from which the content emanates, or to persons or corporate bodies responsible for the performance of the content ~~of the item~~.

- ✓ *Supplied title*: The Task Force suggests that this be deleted.
- ✓ *Title*: “or the work contained in it” — Does this need to be “work(s)”?
- ✓ *Tracing*: Although the Task Force agrees that the LC wording is an improvement, we question whether this term is needed in the Glossary. If the term is used in *AACR*, perhaps this is a legacy of card-catalogue technology that should be removed from the rules. It might be appropriate to consider this term along with *Entry*, *Main entry*, and *Added entry*.