

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/Sec follow-up*

Introduction and Summary

4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/Sec follow-up (referred to as *Sec follow-up* hereafter) generally revises the Chapter 1 and Chapter 13 rules following *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/LC response* (referred to as *LC response* hereafter) and the wording simplification suggested in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up 4/ACOC response*. *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/LC response/ALA response* (referred to as *ALA response* hereafter) generally supported the strategy documented in the LC and ACOC responses. *Sec follow-up* allows us to take a look at how the LC and ACOC strategies work in Chapters 1 and 13 rule by rule.

In general, the Task Force continues to support the positions taken in *ALA response*. The comments below deal primarily with the application of the general principles to specific rules. The comments are organized by term or issue. The following is a summary of the Task Force's observations and recommendations on each:

- A. Delete the non-FRBR use of the term "item."** *ALA response*, as indicated above, supported the strategy of wording simplification suggested in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/ACOC response* (hereafter *ACOC strategy*). This strategy involved deleting the entire phrase "in the item" when it referred to information found in, or transcribed from, a copy of a manifestation. The Task Force saw no substantial problems with the ACOC wording simplification as applied in *Sec follow-up*; in fact, the Task Force has listed other rules where the same strategy could also be used.
- B. "Bibliographic resource."** *ALA response* noted that the definition for bibliographic resource "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 LC response did not really clarify when use of "bibliographic resource" would be appropriate. The term was carried over from *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4* as a substitute for "item" if no reference was made to the rule in the LC response. "Bibliographic resource" in the revised definition proposed by LC ("A generic entity that is the object of bibliographic description") would appear to be appropriate in situations where the cataloger is still at the pre-cataloging "What is being cataloged" stage (cf. LCRI 1.0) or in situations where AACR "item" could refer to more than one level of the FRBR hierarchy.
- C. "Manifestation."** *ALA response* provisionally supported the LC proposal to use "manifestation" when the rule applies to attributes of all copies and "item" when instructed to transcribe from the particular copy at hand any attribute (whether for the manifestation, expression, or work) or to quote or otherwise to use

- information found." In practice, the result is that the literalistic scope LC assigns to "item" results in a number of situations where the rule is intended to apply to the attributes of all copies but "item" continues to be used. The Task Force has noted a number of additional rules where "manifestation" could substitute for "item" if the LC scope note were not followed.
- D. "Edition."** *ALA response* did not support the LC proposal to delete "edition" from Part 1. The *LC response* did not propose revisions systematically and *Sec follow-up* leaves "edition" in many of the rules. However, there are some specific rules where some LC suggestions have been incorporated, and the Task Force generally does not find these to be successful. There are some issues that cannot be resolved by simply substituting terminology. In order to state rules in FRBR terms, a more fundamental reconsideration of the rules is needed.
- E. "Component part."** *ALA response* supported the LC proposal to use of "component part" rather than "constituent parts" and the Task Force noted no problems in the implementation.
- F. Supplements.** *ALA response* supported the LC proposal for various revisions to the rules for supplements, and the Task Force noted no problems in the implementation.
- G. "Multipart item."** The Task Force also had no objections to the various *Sec follow-up* revisions involving "multipart item," whether this involved a change to "multipart monograph," rewording, or wording simplification, with the exception of 1.5B5.
- H. "Material."** *ALA response* supported LC's restriction of the use of the term "material" to the distinction between published and unpublished material. Note that this applies only where the term "material" (singular) alone is used. "Class of materials"/"Class of material" continues to be used but is sometimes shortened to "materials" (plural). Where "material" (singular) alone was used in the rules in the class of materials sense, *Sec follow-up* generally inserts a qualifying "class of" so the usage will not be confused with "material" in the published/unpublished sense. The Task Force does not object to use of "material" in the "class of materials" sense but the plural/singular distinction (if intended) may be too subtle.

Final comment. At least for some, mapping FRBR terminology to AACR is still a source of discomfort that *Sec follow-up* only serves to reinforce. One Task Force member has commented:

What the meaning or meanings of "bibliographic resource" is and what the meaning of "manifestation" is seems critical for a cataloger to understand at the most basic level. At least we need to know the outside and inside boundaries of the thing. This will come back again and again to haunt understanding of the rules and training in the rules, not to mention writing of the rules, unless it is clear—for everything—maps, books, serials, printed music, sound recordings, etc. FRBR as far as AACR is concerned best fits into part II with works and expressions. But the manifestation/item/whole resource concepts of FRBR don't seem to fit with part I well at all.

For example, take a book for which a note is necessary that says "Reproduced from a photographic copy of the pages of a hand made book of text and rubbings" (example from Notes for catalogers. Salinger and Zagon, 1985). Does it make it easier (a.k.a. does it matter) at the point/time of transcription/description—when relationships are alluded to but formal access points have not been formulated—how we will eventually determine in a secondary step whether to classify it as a work, expression, manifestation, edition, or item and whether it needs a minimal record, new record, or no bibliographic record but just a local note on an "item line" of a bibliographic record, or if it needs a uniform title, subjects and class number?

Take another note example: "Chapters 1-4 of the introd. originally presented as the editor's thesis (Bryn Mawr College, 1917)." What does this say about the FRBR's work, expression, manifestation or even about edition—this could be in reference to any of these, and I'm not sure how much FRBR is helping out at the time a cataloger records such a note.

ALA response emphasized the need to include information in the AACR General Introduction covering the use of a problematic term like "bibliographic resource," its broader context, and its relation to the FRBR Type 1 terms. The Task Force can only reaffirm the original note of caution in the *ALA response*: "This explanatory section of the General Introduction is a critical component to the successful incorporation of FRBR terminology in AACR and ... final decisions cannot be made without having that text available for review."

Acknowledgement: The Task Force acknowledges the assistance of Pat Riva whose comments on *Sec follow-up* were shared with the Task Force on Consistency and were forwarded to this Task Force.

Specific Comments

Note: marked up rules are quoted from *Sec follow-up* unless otherwise indicated. Task Force modifications are in blue.

A. Delete "item" from the rule

The Task Force supports the strategy originally employed in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4* and expanded in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/ACOC response* where the term "item" is deleted from some rules "where it was considered superfluous or did not readily translate into a FRBR term." Unless otherwise noted, the Task Force believes that those revisions pertaining to the deletion of the term "item" can be accepted without comment. The *ACOC strategy* was applied in *Sec follow-up* to the following rules:

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---------------|------------------|
| 1.0D1 | 1.1B1 | 1.2B1 | 1.5B2 |
| 1.0D2 | 1.1B3 | 1.4C4 | 1.5C1 |
| 1.0D3 | 1.1F1 | 1.4F2 | 1.5D1 |
| 1.0E1 | 1.1F2 | 1.4F7 | 13.5A |
| 1.0F1 | 1.1F8 | 1.5B (header) | 13.5B1 (in part) |

In addition, the Task Force recommends that the ACOC strategy be applied to the following rules. There was general agreement that an instruction to transcribe — which implies that we are talking about something that is found in an item — need not include

the phrase “in the item.” However, some Task Force members have expressed discomfort when only the term “appears” carries the same implications. The statement “If [element x] appears, do something about it” may not indicate strongly that we are talking about data found within the item as opposed to data found outside the item.

If JSC does not agree with the ACOC strategy because of the ambiguity of “appears,” the Task Force recommends that “item” be replaced with “manifestation.” It is true that transcription is always from the particular exemplar used by the cataloger, but it is also true that we are trying to transcribe data that appears on all copies of the manifestation.

1.4C5. The Task Force supports the recommendation in *4JSC/ALA/53*, p. 16 that the first sentence would be modified to:

If two or more places in which a publisher, distributor, etc., has offices are named ~~in the item~~, give the first named place.

1.4F1. The Task Force supports the recommendation in *4JSC/ALA/53*, p. 34; in the spirit of simplification, “found” could also be deleted from the beginning of the 3rd sentence of the first paragraph, so that the sentence would read:

“If the date ~~found~~ is not of the Gregorian or Julian calendar, give the date as found and follow it with the year(s) of the Gregorian or Julian calendar.”

Other parts of this rule are covered in sections D. and H.

1.4G1. The Task Force supports the recommendation in *4JSC/ALA/53*, p. 46, to replace “found in the item” with “appear”:

If the name of the publisher is unknown and the place and name of the manufacturer ~~appear are found in the item~~, give the place and name of the manufacturer.

1.4G4. The Task Force supports the recommendation in *4JSC/ALA/53*, p. 47, to replace “are found in the item” with “appear”:

Give the place, name of manufacturer, and/or date of manufacture if they ~~appear are found in the item~~ and differ from the place, name of publisher, distributor, etc., and date of publication, distribution, etc., and are considered to be important.

1.6F1. See comments on “transcribe” above. Pat Riva has suggested that “manifestation” be used on the grounds that the ISSN should appear in all copies of the same manifestation.

Transcribe Give the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) of a series if it appears ~~in the item being described~~ (see also 1.6H7). Give the ISSN in the standard manner (i.e., ISSN followed by a space and two groups of four digits separated by a hyphen).

1.6G1. The Task Force recommends use of the ACOC *strategy* in the third paragraph, rewritten to:

“If the numbering that appears [on the item](#) is known to be incorrect, transcribe it as found and add the correct numbering in square brackets.”

Another case where leaving in reference to the item suggests that the numbering is incorrect on only one of the copies.

1.6H7. See comment at 1.6F1.

B. “Bibliographic resource”

Where *LC response* did not replace “item” with “manifestation,” *Sec follow-up* uses “bibliographic resource” following *4JSC.Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4*. The *LC response* does not provide a rationale for using “bibliographic resource.” The Task Force has so far come up with 4 possible justifications for using the term. Categories 1. **Ambiguous hierarchic level** and 3. **What is being cataloged?** would appear to be the rationale for most uses of “bibliographic resource.”

1. **Ambiguous hierarchic level.** Some rules are stated so generically that they could be talking about work, expression or manifestation; use of any of the FRBR terms would limit the meaning of the rule in ways that were never intended and may not be appropriate.
2. **General term for all classes of materials.** Some rules are talking about classes of materials in such a general way that some term needs to be used that suggests that the rule applies to any or all classes; this was the original definition of “bibliographic resource” in the Glossary.
3. **What is being cataloged?** Many of the rules in the current text use “item” to make a distinction between the manifestation, the physical thing being described, and what the cataloger has chosen to describe. The most common case of this is the analytic situation. The FRBR entities are always described as a tower with a single work at the top; it is also legitimate — and necessary in some cases — to turn the tower on its head. The same item may be a manifestation of more than one work. A single-volume festschrift published in a monographic series is at the same time a manifestation of the works represented by each chapter; a manifestation of the festschrift as a collection; and (if used as the basis for describing the monographic series as a serial) a manifestation of a serial. Same item — different manifestations of different works; the manifestations of each work are distinct; they have different titles, different statements of responsibility, etc. It is impossible to talk unambiguously about manifestation until a decision has been made about which is being described. In the cases where this sense is implied, it appears the rule is contingent on a decision about what will be cataloged made at the pre-cataloging stage, or the rule is literally being evoked at the pre-cataloging stage; this somewhat narrow application would be appropriate where the context involves whole/part or primary/secondary relationships that are contingent on a pre-cataloging decision, or where the rules appear to be situated at the pre-cataloging stage. Or, rationale #3 can be applied very broadly — in a sense, all objects of cataloging are contingent on pre-cataloging decisions.
4. **Multiple manifestations/One bibliographic record.** “Manifestation” is ambiguous in another way. Traditionally, our practices on when to make a new record are based on the concept of “edition” which does not exactly match the concept of manifestation. FRBR may leave us little choice but to treat as a distinct manifestation any group of items that differ from other items in any attribute of the manifestation. Yet, in AACR and more specifically in the guidelines on when to make a new record that CC:DA just approved,

there are extensive lists of minor changes: differences between items for which we are not to make a separate description. So what we are describing is, in many cases, an abstract idealization of a group of items exemplifying multiple manifestations. In that context, to talk about a manifestation is ambiguous; "bibliographic resource" is a term that can stand for that cataloger-created idealization that we used to call "edition."

On the Task Force, reaction to the "bibliographic resource" concept continues to range over the spectrum. One member considers the attempt to incorporate FRBR terminology in AACR part 1 to be fundamentally misguided (FRBR is really only relevant to part 2); from this standpoint, use of a non-FRBR term is generally preferred. Another member does not believe a strong enough case has been made for introducing a non-FRBR term into the rules; "manifestation" is generally the preferred term from this standpoint. This is not to imply that those in the "middle" have a unified vision of where to go with this terminology.

Generally, the technique used in the official Task Force response in this section is to suspend judgment to the extent possible on the value of this controversial term and consider whether it can be fitted into any of the rationales we have listed above that appear to be implied in the *LC response*; the exercise is necessarily a little speculative. The comments are intended to raise questions that would need to be addressed when the proposed Introduction to AACR is finally drafted; it should be evident that in a number of cases, even when there is some agreement about the appropriateness of the term, there may be disagreement about which of the rationales listed (1.-4.) was intended. The comments indicate that there is often disagreement about what cataloging scenario is in the background of a stated rule. It is hoped that the Introduction will provide such a scenario, and that the scenario will provide a firmer foundation for determining the appropriate assignment of terminology in the rules.

1.0C1, 1.0D, 1.0D3. The rationale for the generic "bibliographic resource" is **3. What is being cataloged?**, either because the context of those rules is a pre-cataloging stage in the series of decisions that lead to the creation of the bibliographic description (the implied scenario is arguable) or simply because in the 1.0 rules taken as a whole "what is being cataloged" is being presented in the broadest possible sense. At this level, the rules are general enough not to imply a determinate manifestation (if you think "bibliographic resource" is viable); this may not always be the case in the area-specific rules, although within the Task Force there is some disagreement at particular area-specific rules, as this document makes clear. For 1.0C1, see also the comment on "individual" in Section I.

1.1A2. "Take information recorded in this area from the chief source of information for the class of materials ~~material~~ to which the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ being described belongs."

Here "bibliographic resource" is being used according to the sense described under **2. General term for all classes of materials**. See also comment on "class of materials" under Section H. below.

1.1B8. “If the chief source of information bears titles in two or more languages or scripts, transcribe as the title proper the one in the language or script of the main written, spoken, or sung content of the bibliographic resource item.”

Perhaps “expression” would apply here.

1.1B9. “If the title proper for a bibliographic resource an item that is a supplement supplementary to, or a section of, another bibliographic resource item appears in two or more parts not grammatically linked, give the title of the main bibliographic resource work first, followed by the title(s) of ...”

The context of this rule would fall into the **3. What is being cataloged?** type for which the generic term is considered to be most useful. What is primary/what is supplementary is contingent on a pre-cataloging decision.

1.1C2. “If a bibliographic resource an item consists of material falling within one category in the list chosen, give the appropriate designation immediately following the title proper ... In the case of a bibliographic resource an item having no collective title, give the appropriate designation ...”

This rule appears to apply to a specific manifestation, as with 1.1G. One member thinks the second use of “bibliographic resource” is an instance of type **3. What is being cataloged** interpreted in the broad sense.

1.1C3. “If the bibliographic resource item is a reproduction in one format material of a work originally presented in another format material...”

1.5A3 and the 1.11 rules use “manifestation” for situations dealing with different formats. Why not use “manifestation” here as well?

1.1C4. “If a bibliographic resource an item contains parts belonging to materials falling into two or more categories ...”

Like the 1.10 rules, the generic term is appropriate perhaps because **2. General term for all classes of materials** is needed for this rule. Compare 1.1G. See also the comment under Section H. for 1.1C4.

1.1D3. “Transcribe an original title in a language different from that of the title proper appearing in the chief source of information as a parallel title if the bibliographic resource item contains all or some of the text in the original language, or if the original title appears before the title proper in the chief source of information. Transcribe as other title information ...”

The language of this rule appears to be referring to the physical entity; “manifestation” appears to be appropriate in this case.

1.1G. Bibliographic resources ~~Items~~ without a collective title.

For the 1.1G rules (1.1G, 1.1G1, 1.1G2, 1.1G3, 1.1G4 and also 1.2B6), why not “manifestation?” The examples refer to a situation where a publisher is issuing a set of copies and the publisher decision is not to assign a collective title to the chief source of the publication; this does not appear to be a **3. What is being cataloged** question as in the 1.0 rules, so why do we need to use the generic term?

1.2B6. “If a bibliographic resource ~~an item~~ lacking a collective title contains one or more ...” See comment at 1.1G.

1.2D3. The original language of the rule is: “Do not record statements relating to a reissue of an edition that contains no changes unless the item is considered to be of particular importance to the cataloguing agency.” *Sec follow-up* follows 4JSC/Sec/6 and removes “to the cataloguing agency”:

Do not record statements relating to a reissue of an edition that contains no changes unless the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ is considered to be important.”

The Task Force agrees with the Consistency Task Force’s objection in 4JSC/ALA/49 Rev (p. 32) that what is important in the original rule is the resource rather than the content, while the language of *Sec follow-up* (following 4JSC/Sec/6) appears to emphasize the content. The Consistency Task Force advocated that the original rule language only be modified to replace “item” with “bibliographic resource.” While most of the rules modified in 4JSC/Sec/6 are about the importance of the data to be transcribed (or omitted), some rules are about the importance of the resource itself. This is more or less a special-collections/collection development evaluation; it might be based on the content (they collect all exemplars of a particular work and therefore describe each one separately — in this case, each impression or issue whether it has an edition statement or not); it might be based on the manifestation (all publications of a particular press, again separately described) or even a particular item (all items owned by a particular person, with detailed description of each, including which impression or issue it belongs to). Here use of “bibliographic resource” would be according to **1. Ambiguous hierarchic level**. (The justification for retaining “to the cataloguing agency” is also based on the decisions of individual collection managers, not a national policy on what data is important but is probably out of scope for the FRBR response.) One member expressed preference for “manifestation” rather than “bibliographic resource.”

1.5B5. See Section G. below.

1.5D2. “*Optionally*, if the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ is in a container, name the container and give its dimensions *either* after the dimensions of the manifestation ~~item~~ *or* as the only dimensions. ...”

Based on *LC response*, *Sec follow-up* replaces first instance of “item” with “bibliographic resource” and the second instance with “manifestation.” Why not use “manifestation” in the first instance?

1.6B1. “If a bibliographic resource is issued in a series, transcribe the series as instructed ...”

The generic term is being used apparently because of **1. Ambiguous hierarchic level** (series assigned by the author as attribute of the work; series assigned by publisher as attribute of the manifestation). One member thinks **3. What is being cataloged?** applies in the broad sense. One member does feel strongly that series is an attribute of the manifestation.

1.6B2. “Give the other form(s) in the note area if of value in identifying the bibliographic resource. If the title of the series does not appear in the first of the prescribed sources of information and different forms appear elsewhere in the bibliographic resource, choose the title given in the other prescribed sources in the order of preference for the sources ...”

If we agree that the comment on 1.6B1 is correct, it applies in the first instance of “bibliographic resource” in 1.6B2. But the second instance of “bibliographic resource” seems to be a reference to the physical set of copies. For the second instance, the ACOC strategy would not work, since “appear elsewhere” might be misconstrued as reference sources, so the second “bibliographic resource” should be replaced by “manifestation” and not just rewritten to drop “item.” One member would use “bibliographic resources” in both instances rather than use different terms within the same rule.

1.6G1. “Give the numbering of the bibliographic resource within the series in the terms given in the item.” See 1.6B1 for the rationale for “bibliographic resource.”

1.6G3. “*Optionally*, if a bibliographic resource has both numeric and/or alphabetic designation and a chronological designation, give ...” See 1.6B1.

1.6H1. “If a bibliographic resource is one of a subseries ...” See 1.6B1.

1.6H2. “If the main series and subseries titles appear in more than one language or script, choose as the title proper for the series area the main series and subseries titles in the language (or the clearly predominant language) of the particular bibliographic resource being catalogued.”

Wouldn’t “expression” apply here? But an “expression” can’t be cataloged, so “manifestation” seems best, since in this context, transcription of data applying to all copies is implied.

1.6J1. “If a bibliographic resource belongs to two or more series and/or two or more series and subseries, ...” See 1.6B1.

1.7B2. “Language of the bibliographic resource.”

Why not “Language of the expression?”

1.7B4. [no change made by *Sec follow-up*] “Make notes on titles by which a bibliographic resource is commonly known or on titles borne by the resource other than the title proper if considered to be important.”

The generic term seems appropriate; a commonly known title could be an attribute of a work, expression, or a manifestation (**1. Ambiguous hierarchic level**); in some cases it may not be an attribute of any of these. But “borne by the resource” could be “borne by the manifestation;” at this point the rule refers to an attribute of the manifestation. If mixing generic and FRBR terminology in the same sentence is considered problematic, either 2 sentences or separate paragraphs could be used.

1.7B13. Dissertations. “If the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ being described is a dissertation or thesis presented as part of the requirements for an academic degree, give *Thesis* followed by a brief statement of the degree for which the author was a candidate ...”

It is not clear why “manifestation” couldn’t be used instead of “bibliographic resource;” ambiguity within the FRBR hierarchy is not an issue, “What is being cataloged” seems straightforward. Alternatively, a variant of the ACOC strategy could be used: “[For a dissertation or thesis presented as part of the requirements for an academic degree, give *Thesis* followed by a brief ...](#)”

1.7B16. “Give the details of other formats in which the content of the bibliographic resource has been issued.”

Appears to be an instance of **1. Ambiguous hierarchic level**. Content could refer to manifestation, expression, or work.

1.7B19. Numbers associated with the bibliographic resource.

Numbers would appear to be an attribute of the manifestation. Cf. Pat Riva comment in Section A. under 1.6F1. The 1.7B19 rule is related to 1.8B3. Others think **3. What is being cataloged?** (understood in the broad sense) applies; their point of view is that “bibliographic resource” should be used.

1.7B21. “With” notes. “If the title and statement of responsibility area contains a title that applies to only a component part of a bibliographic resource ~~an item~~ lacking a collective title and, therefore, more than one description is made (see 1.1G2), make a note beginning *With:* and listing the other separately titled component parts ~~works~~ in the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ in the order in which they appear.”

It's not entirely clear whether this rule applies only to a unique manifestation or a set of copies of multiple works, each copy bound together in the same way. In any case, "What is being cataloged?" (part/whole relationship) is the issue, so usage appears appropriate in terms of the guidelines.

1.8B1. "Give the International Standard Book Number (ISBN), or International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), or any other internationally agreed standard number for the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ being described. Give such numbers with the agreed abbreviation and with the standard spacing or hyphenation."

Standard numbers may refer to the serial, issue, or article. **3. "What is being cataloged?"** (Part/whole relationship is the context of the rule) This also applies to 1.8B2 and 1.8E1.

1.8B3. See 1.7B19.

1.10. The 1.10 rules (1.10A, 1.10B, 1.10C, 1.10C1 and 1.10C2) apply to "Items made up of several types of material." The rationale for using the generic term for rules under 1.10 appears to be **2. General term for all classes of material.**

C. Replace "item" with "manifestation"

The Task Force also supports *4JSC/Chair76/Chair follow-up/4* or *LC response* for situations where the AACR "item" has been replaced with "manifestation" in rules dealing with attributes of the manifestation. This occurs in the following rules:

| | | | |
|-------|--------|-------------|--------|
| 1.4B2 | 1.5B1 | 1.11A–1.11F | 13.4A |
| 1.4B3 | 1.7B22 | 13.1A | 13.5B1 |
| 1.4D4 | 1.8D1 | 13.2A | 13.6A |
| 1.5A3 | | | |

In addition, Pat Riva identified additional rules in which the same logic would apply, because they deal with attributes common to all copies. The Task Force agrees. *LC response* is rather conservative in replacing "item" with "manifestation" since it defines the scope of "item" to all situations where the rule currently instructs to transcribe from the item even when what is transcribed is clearly an attribute of the manifestation. This is misleading where the rule is intended to apply to all copies and not the copy the cataloger has in hand, but could be construed as applying only to an imperfect copy in hand, e.g. 1.1B7.

1.1B7

1.1F10

1.2B4. "*Optional addition.* If an item lacks an edition statement but is known to contain significant changes from other editions, supply a suitable brief statement in the language and script of the title proper and enclose it in square brackets."

LC response would use "manifestation or item;" *ACOC response* recommended "manifestation" alone; because of the difference, *Sec follow-up* let "item" stand.

4JSC/ALA/49/Rev, p. 22 questions the necessity of “or item;” the Task Force concurs with the Consistency Task Force response, and recommendation that the beginning of the sentence should be revised to

“If a manifestation ~~an item~~ lacks an edition statement . . .”

Perhaps LC was allowing for the possibility that the item in hand might seem to be a copy of the same manifestation except for the edition statement and wanted the cataloger to supply the statement in that case. But we would not always want to do this, as one member points out. For example, if what you have in hand seems to be a copy of a manifestation except for the edition statement, it may be a different manifestation, e.g. a conference published in a serial and also a separate monograph, where the separate monograph has an edition statement, or a reprint edition.

1.2C3

1.2C4

1.2C5

1.2D1

1.2E2

1.4B6

1.6H1. “both the series and subseries are named in the item.” Probably “in the item” could be deleted. If this is considered too ambiguous, the Task Force would favor replacement with “manifestation.”

1.8B4

There were other rules where *Sec follow-up* used “item” where there was some disagreement within the Task Force, although the disagreement may be moot if JSC accepts 4JSC/LC/59 (See Addendum).

1.0A2, 1.0H, 1.0H2, 1.0H2: Pat Riva has suggested that “item” and “items” should be replaced by “manifestation” in these rules. The Task Force agrees on the 1.0Hx rules, but there is some disagreement within the Task Force on whether “item” and “items” in 1.0A2 should be replaced by “manifestation.”

Majority opinion. The majority opinion is that, contra *Sec follow-up*, 1.0A2 is intended for situations where the manifestation as a whole was issued without a chief source. Therefore, “item” should be replaced by “manifestation” (or, in the third instance, by “bibliographic resource” since the intellectual content is an attribute of the work. The revised rule would then read (Task Force in blue):

1.0A2. Manifestations ~~Items~~ lacking a chief source of information. If no part of the manifestation ~~item~~ supplies data that can be used as the basis of the description, take the necessary information from any available source, whether this be a reference source work or the content of the bibliographic resource ~~item~~ itself. This technique may be necessary for printed materials ~~works~~, the title pages of which are lost; collections of pamphlets or other minor material assembled by the library or by a previous owner and that are to be catalogued using as a single bibliographic description ~~item~~; nonprocessed sound recordings [text omitted]. In all such cases give in a note the reason for and/or source of the supplied data

Minority opinion. 1.0A2 is responding to 2 different scenarios, and only one of the scenarios could be construed to refer to the manifestation as a whole. Unless the

rule is split, *Sec follow-up* use of “item” is making the best of a confusing situation. The one scenario seems to be item-specific (“This technique may be necessary for printed materials, the title pages of which are lost;” the implication is that some items not available to the cataloger have their title pages); the other scenario appears to be describing, at best, a “unique” manifestation (“collections of pamphlets or other minor material assembled by the library or by a previous owner and that are to be catalogued using a single bibliographic description”). Agree that “content” is an attribute of work so the third use of “item” is dubious, but in that case, why not “content of the work?”

Addendum. The Task Force notes that 4JSC/LC/59 has completely rewritten the current 1.0A2 where it appears to have been relocated under 1.0A3 c) *Bibliographic resource lacking a chief source of information*. In the rewritten version, the lost title page scenario has been removed, removing the implication that one aspect of the rule was item-specific; the rewritten version appears to be restricted to “unique manifestations.” The LC proposal uses “bibliographic resource” throughout rather than “item.”

- 1.5B4.** “If the manifestation ~~item~~ being described has a playing time, give that playing time as follows.
- a. If the playing time is stated on the item, give the playing time as stated.
 - b. If the playing time is not stated on the item but is readily ascertainable, give it.
 - c. *Optionally*, if the playing time is neither stated on the item nor readily ascertainable, give an approximate time.”

There was some disagreement about the use of “manifestation” and “item.” This is probably a good case study in the difficulties of selecting the right term referred to at the conclusion of the Task Force introduction. At the general level, “manifestation” is used, but in the subrules “item” is used. Pat Riva has suggested that this might be a problem. Is this a case of being “inconsistent” or is the main rule at a different hierarchic level from the subrules? In the subrules, the use of “item” is consistent with the *LC response* guidelines (use “item” when the focus is on the item being described) but the intent of the subrules is surely to describe at manifestation level. However, one could argue that the context of this particular rule is analogous to edition statements. Just as the transcription of edition data as a statement has the practical benefit of allowing the cataloger to avoid the question of deciding whether a new expression is being described, so the instruction to give the playing time “as stated on the item” absolves the cataloger from determining the actual playing time of the manifestation; focusing on the item in hand in the subrules makes sense in this context. Although one suggestion is to use the *ACOC strategy* and delete the “item” terms in the subrules, to do so might be to lose the distinction between playing time as stated and the actual playing time. Perhaps the phrase “If the playing time is stated on the item” could be re-worded to “If there is a playing time statement,” the analogy being with “edition statement” and “revision statement” (see 1.2D1 in Section D. Edition). And, should “bibliographic resource” be used instead of “manifestation” in the main rule because the reference is to content (**1. Ambiguous hierarchic level**) rather than the set of attributes associated with the copies?

1.7A3. The Task Force disagreement on this rule also reflects the conflicting scenarios alluded to in the Task Force introduction. *Sec follow-up* is consistent with the *LC response* proposal and retains “item” in the rules: “Give quotations from the item or from other source...” and “Refer to passages in the item, or in other sources ...” These passages resist the *ACOC strategy* for eliminating “item,” and arguably in this case the item, the physical avatar, is being contrasted with “other sources” in the rule. However, one member prefers “manifestation” (the citation applies to all copies) and another prefers “bibliographic resource” (the citation may be referring in some cases to the manifestation, in other cases to the expression or work-levels). One member argues plausibly (see the Task Force Introduction) that at this point the cataloger has not necessarily made a decision at what analytic level to catalog, so perhaps the generic term is the best solution in this case.

D. “EDITION”

LC response proposed replacing “edition” with “expression” or “edition statement” as appropriate in Chapter 1, but did not propose revisions systematically. *ALA response* expressed misgivings, and the specific proposals included in *Sec follow-up* support those misgivings. The underlying problem is that “edition” is a concept that is well established in the world of scholarship and publishing, but its definition does not match the FRBR definition of either “manifestation” or “expression.” All editions are distinct manifestations, but not all editions are distinct expressions. In addition, one member sees “edition statement” as an attribute of manifestation, expression, or work, depending on the context, although this usage deviates from the growing consensus reflected in 4JSC/ALA/49/Rev.

There are some issues that cannot be resolved by simply substituting terminology. In order to state rules in FRBR terms, a more fundamental reconsideration of the rules is needed. This is definitely true with respect to the use of “edition” in AACR. The Task Force recommends that such a reconsideration of the concept of “edition,” particularly in part 1, be proposed.

In the meantime, we offer comments on some of the specific rules using the term “edition”:

1.2B4: *Sec follow-up* notes that ACOC and LC disagree on revised wording for this rule and therefore no change is included. However, ACOC and LC both agree that the term “expression” should be included in this rule. ACOC prefers Pat Riva’s original proposal:

1.2B4. Optional addition. If a manifestation ~~an item~~ lacks an edition statement but is known to contain significant changes from other editions, sufficient to constitute a new expression, supply a suitable brief statement in the language and script of the title proper and enclose it in square brackets.

LC response suggested different language:

1.2B4. Optional addition. If a manifestation or ~~an~~ item lacks an edition statement for the expression of the work but is known to contain significant changes from other

expressions ~~editions~~, supply a suitable brief statement in the language and script of the title proper and enclose it in square brackets.

The Task Force generally agrees that the term “expression” should be introduced in this rule. We prefer the LC approach, because it moves away from use of the term “edition.” However, one member would word the rule “If a manifestation lacks an edition statement but is known to contain significant changes from other manifestations, supply ...”. This would allow for a supplied edition statement for a reprint edition.

Note: The question of “manifestation” vs. “manifestation or item” in 1.2B4 is discussed in Section C. above.

Note: 4JSC/ALA/49/Rev prematurely accepted the LC response.

1.2C1: This rule is perhaps the most difficult to revise purely by substituting terms. A statement of responsibility is an attribute of the manifestation and this rule is about such statements, even though the responsibility indicated may indeed apply to expressions. The Task Force does not agree on a proposal that would eliminate the term “edition” from this rule. However, one Task Force member has offered a proposal revising the 1.2C header and the rules under it using “expression.” The revised header and the revised 1.2C1 follow as examples.

1.2C. Statements of responsibility for the expression ~~relating to the edition~~

1.2C1. Transcribe a statement of responsibility ~~relating to one or more editions~~ for the expression identified in the edition statement, but not ~~for~~ for ~~to~~ all expressions ~~editions, of a given work~~ following the edition statement ~~if there is one~~. Follow the instructions in 1.1F for the transcription and punctuation of such statements.

However, once we re-define the intent of the 1.2C rules as applying to “expression,” the scope of the rule changes from an instruction on where to transcribe statements of responsibility found on the item in hand to an imaginatively radical (or, technically, reactionary) re-thinking of the structure of the bibliographic record. The member first reviews the intent of the rule as written, and then follows with a speculation.

First, what is the function of this rule? There are two types of statement of responsibility: those that are transcribed in area 1 and those that are transcribed in area 2. One of the main functions of this rule is to help the cataloger tell which ones to transcribe in area 2. In this context, FRBR terminology might be helpful. However, **all** statements appear in the manifestation, so that isn’t terribly helpful. On the other hand, not all statements describing responsibility for the expression are transcribed in area 2. Typically, statements of responsibility describe authorship (*work*), editorial activity (*expression*), translation (*expression*), or responsibility for additional material such as illustrations or introductory material (*expression*). Most of these statements are transcribed in area 1; only in the case of responsibility for revised content (which clearly is a new *expression*) are the statements transcribed in area 2.

Back to the Future: But why stop there. If the scope of the rule is defined as applying to “expressions”, then the use of area 2 could be used to restructure the bibliographic record in terms of the FRBR entities. It would be possible to distinguish between

statements of responsibility for the work, to be transcribed in area 1, and statements of responsibility for the expression, to be transcribed in area 2. The technique uses the optional rule (1.2B4) to supply an edition statement. The technique is not new, but goes back to book catalogs such as the *British Museum Catalogue*, which it is typical under a prolific author to find long lists that begin “[Another edition.]. If the option to supply an edition statement were to become an instruction to supply an expression identifier of some kind, then statements of responsibility for an expression could always be transcribed in area 2, and area 1 could be reserved for statements of responsibility for the work. The results might look something like:

Swann's way / by Marcel Proust. – [English text] / translated by C. K. Scott Moncrieff ; introduction by Lewis Galantière.

The complete works of Shakespeare. – [New edition] / edited with a glossary by W.J. Craig.

This idea is so old that it can only be considered futuristic! However, maybe its time has come ... again.

The Task Force isn't ready to go there yet, but finds this to be a useful illustration of the problems and potential involved with substituting “expression” for “edition.” To address present concerns, one member has suggested that JSC consider the rewording suggested for 1.2C1, consider applying it in a similar way to 1.2C3, 1.2C4, and 1.2C5, and substitute “edition statement” for “edition” in the header, i.e.,

1.2C. Statements of responsibility relating to the edition statement

1.2D1:

“If an item has a statement indicating a revision ~~is a revision of an edition~~ (e.g., a named reissue of a particular “edition” containing changes from that “edition”), transcribe the statement relating to that revision following the edition statement and its statements of responsibility.”

The Task Force generally does not see the use of scare quotes as a good strategy for eliminating the use of the word “edition.” It also fails to accomplish the goal intended. By going back to the function of this rule, it should be possible to achieve a more positive result.

Rules 1.2D and E deal with what might be termed a **subordinate edition statement**. In other words, the important thing is not whether the statements indicate an expression, a manifestation, or an “edition” – but rather that the item carries two statements that are distinct but which have a particular logical relationship. The first statement applies to all copies of the “edition” but the second statement only applies to a subset of copies. The rule should be stated in terms of this relationship. The following is suggested for 1.2D1:

1.2D. Statement relating to a named revision ~~of an edition~~

1.2D1. If an item has, in addition to an edition statement, a statement indicating is a revision ~~of an edition~~ (e.g., a named reissue ~~of a particular edition~~ containing changes

from ~~that edition~~ the expression or manifestation indicated in the edition statement), transcribe the revision statement ~~relating to that revision~~ following the edition statement and its statements of responsibility.

The parenthetical statement (in blue) does not seem to be necessary, but if it is retained, it should be revised as indicated.

1.2D3:

1.2D3. Do not record statements relating to a reissue of an edition that contains no changes unless the bibliographic resource item is considered to be important ~~of particular importance to the cataloguing agency~~.

If the Task Force's recommendation for 1.2D1 is accepted, a similar revision should be made to 1.2D3:

1.2D3. Do not record statements relating to a reissue ~~of an edition~~ that contains no changes unless the bibliographic resource item is considered to be important ~~of particular importance to the cataloguing agency~~.

Note: The revision to the last part of this rule is covered in section B. above.

1.2E1: This rule does not appear in *Sec follow-up*. However, if the LC wording for 1.2D1 is accepted, then a similar revision should be made to 1.2E:

1.2E. Statements of responsibility relating to a named revision of an “edition”

1.2E1. Transcribe a statement of responsibility relating to one or more named revisions of an “edition” (but not to all such revisions) following the statement relating to the revision(s). Follow the instructions in 1.1F for the transcription and punctuation of such statements of responsibility.

However, if the Task Force's recommendation for 1.2D1 above is accepted, then a similar revision would be appropriate at 1.2E:

1.2E. Statements of responsibility relating to a named revision ~~of an edition~~

1.2E1. Transcribe a statement of responsibility for ~~relating to one or more a~~ named revision ~~revisions of an edition~~ (but not to all such revisions) following the revision statement ~~relating to the revision(s)~~. Follow the instructions in 1.1F for the transcription and punctuation of such statements of responsibility.

1.4F1:

1.4F1. For published material items, give the date (i.e., year) of publication, ~~distribution, etc., of the edition, revision, etc., named in the edition area. If there is no edition statement, give the date of the first publication of the edition to which the item belongs.~~ Give dates in Western-style arabic numerals. If the date found ~~in the item~~ is not of the

Gregorian or Julian calendar, give the date as found and follow it with the year(s) of the Gregorian or Julian calendar.”

The strategy here is somewhat akin to the ACOC simplification technique for “item,” but Pat Riva suggests that too much useful guidance has been eliminated from the rule. The Task Force agrees. The assumption that, in most cases, a separate record is made for each *edition*, but not for each manifestation of that edition, is basic to standard shared cataloging practice. The instruction that the date of publication should be the date of the first publication (usually, the first printing) of the edition — unless a different manifestation is identified in the edition statement — is valuable guidance.

Once again, there seems to be no simple way of stating this using FRBR terminology. Therefore, the Task Force cites this as further justification for its recommendation that a more thorough examination of the concept of edition in part 1 of AACR be undertaken.

E. “Component parts”

The Task Force also supports *LC response* re “component parts” in preference to *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4* where “constituent parts” is used. (“Component parts” preferred as a replacement to “constituent parts” to replace “individual works” for the reasons stated by LC) The decision applies to the following rules:

| | | | |
|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| 1.1B10 | 1.1G3 | 1.2B6 | 1.10C3 |
| 1.1G2 | 1.1G4 | 1.7B21 | |

F. Supplements

ALA response had no disagreement with the LC response revisions for replacing “Supplementary items” with Independent and Dependent Supplements. The Task Force found nothing objectionable in the revision of the specific rules; the procedure is somewhat similar to the ACOC strategy.

| | | |
|-------|-------|-------|
| 1.1B9 | 1.9A | 1.9B |
| 1.9 | 1.9A1 | 1.9B1 |

G. Replace “multipart item” with “multipart monograph”

The Task Force noted no problems where “multipart item” is revised by “multipart monograph” or a variant thereof. There were problems with 1.5B5, because the original rule is ambiguous. The scope of 1.5B5 is not restricted to multipart monographs although the original language implies such a restriction.

1.0H2. The replacement of the paragraph header “Multipart items” by “In multiple parts” is acceptable.
1.4D4

1.4F8

1.5B5. “In describing a multipart manifestation item that is not yet complete, give the specific material designation alone.”

4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/ACOC response suggests using “bibliographic resource issued in more than one part” instead of “multipart manifestation,” ACOC probably considering this to be a 3. “**What is being cataloged?**” (part/whole) situation. See general discussion on “bibliographic resource” in Section B. above. *Sec follow-up* use of “multipart manifestation” does differentiate, if perhaps oversubtly, from “multipart monograph,” but ACOC *response* “issued in more than one part” is clearer. If the bibliographic resource rationale is accepted, the ACOC emendation is acceptable as written; if not, the amended wording would be: “In describing a manifestation issued in more than one part that is not yet complete, give the specific material designation.” The phrasing employed in 1.7B20 (“serial, integrating resource, or multipart monograph”) can’t be used instead of “bibliographic resource/manifestation” since some integrating resources are complete in one part; the scope of 1.7B20 (“library’s holdings”) is broader than 1.5B5.

1.6G2

1.7B20. (“multipart item” replaced by “serial, integrating resource, or multipart monograph”) *LC response* is expanding the scope of the rule; The Task Force has no objection.

1.7B23

H. “Material”; “Class of materials”; “Materials”

ALA supported *LC response* on using the term “material” when describing published and unpublished material. However, the use of the phrase and the concept “class of materials” continues. Unless further qualified, “material” (singular) is used in the published/unpublished sense; “materials” (plural) is used in the class of materials sense. Where “item” or “works” needs to be replaced, additional care is taken to distinguish between “material” in the published/unpublished sense and “material” in the “class of material” sense through the use of qualifiers. If singular/plural is too subtle to differentiate usage, then “material(s)” should at least always require some modifier (“class of” or specific type, e.g. “printed”) to disambiguate; see comment at 1.0D.

1.0A1: “Each chapter in part I contains a specification of the chief source of information for each class of material or type of publication covered by the chapter.”

Rationale: if “material” alone is to be used for describing published/unpublished, then use of the term in the “class of material” sense needs to be made explicit. Should it be “class of materials” to be consistent with usage elsewhere (although it sounds odd gramatically)?

1.0A2: “This technique may be necessary for printed materials ~~works~~, the title pages of which are lost, collections of pamphlets or other minor material assembled by the library ...”

The replacement of “works” is by a class of materials (note plural) phrase; published/unpublished not an issue.

1.0D: “Include this minimum set of elements for all material items being cataloged at the chosen level when the elements are applicable to the bibliographic resource item being described and when, in the case of optional additions, the library has chosen to include an optional element.”

Here “material” appears to function as a synonym for “bibliographic resource” in the sense noted under Section B. **2. General term for all classes of materials**, rather than in the published/unpublished sense. No strong consensus on a replacement term. The options seem to be: “bibliographic resources,” “classes of materials” (see comment under Section B., b.), or “manifestations.”

1.0D3: “Third level of description. For the third level of description, include all elements set out in the following rules that are applicable to ~~the~~ those classes of material to which the bibliographic resource item being described belongs.”

The phrase now echoes the wording of 1.1A2.

1.1A2: *Sec follow-up* replaces “material” (singular) with “class of materials.”

Rationale: to distinguish from the published/unpublished sense.

1.1C4. “If a bibliographic resource ~~an item~~ contains parts belonging to materials falling into two or more categories in the list chosen and if none of these is the predominant component constituent of the bibliographic resource item, give *multimedia* or *kit* (see 1.1C1 and 1.10C1).”

Should be “classes of materials”?

1.4C8: *Sec follow-up* replaces “published items” with “published material” (singular).

Should the plural be used (see comment at 1.0A1 and note use of “printed materials” in 1.0A2).

1.4D8: Same as 1.4C8.

1.4F1: Same as 1.4C8.

1.4F9: *Sec follow-up* replaces “unpublished items” with “unpublished material.”

See comments re singular vs. plural at 1.0A1, 1.4C8.

1.4F10: Same as 1.4C8.

1.5B1: *Sec follow-up* replaces “type of material” with “class of material”; LC has noted that use of “type of material” is inconsistent.

I. Other Comments

“an individual.” 1.0C1: Pat Riva points out that there is no strong reason in the LC response for removing “an individual” from the rule. The Task Force agrees and recommends that the phrase not be removed.

“of a given work.” 1.2C1:

1.2C1. Transcribe a statement of responsibility relating to one or more editions, but not to all editions, ~~of a given work~~ following the edition statement if there is one. ...”

Note: The suggestion to delete “of a given work” in the X.2C rules was made in 4JSC/ALA/49/ACOC response, p. 2, and accepted by JSC (4JSC/M/535.3.11). The revision was included in 4JSC/ALA/49/Rev.

Note: See also Section D. above.