

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

From: Task Force on FRBR Terminology

Re: 4JSC/LC/60

GENERAL. The purpose of *4JSC/LC/60* is to incorporate FRBR terminology in the AACR2 appendices based on the responses to *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up 4*, in particular *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up 4/LC response*.

The Task Force on FRBR Terminology (TF in this document) is responding to the Glossary revisions in *LC/60*. Overall, *LC/60* brings out the concepts or elements that relate to, or are attributes of, a manifestation to a greater extent than was the case with *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up 4*. The TF believes that since most of CC:DA would prefer the use of “manifestation” when talking about the attributes of the manifestation even when the rule in question is giving instructions to transcribe from a particular source, and since the LC glossary proposals generally follow this preference, CC:DA should endorse this approach.

John Attig has pointed out that JSC has agreed to use “description” for that part of the record covered by the descriptive cataloging rules, and “record” for the entire set of elements associated with a bibliographic resource: subject cataloging, coded data, and identifying numbers, as well as the descriptive cataloging. So, in general, “bibliographic record” should be replaced by “bibliographic description” in the Glossary.

ALA in *4JSC/CCC/9/ALA response* has expressed difficulties with the terms “main entry” and “access point” and recommended that the AACR communities and JSC come up with a more complete proposal to revise these basic terms and concepts. For the interim ALA has agreed that a full revision of the definition should be deferred. LC’s response to *4JSC/CCC/9* was that “work to revise the term ‘main entry’ should be held until all the AACR Glossary terms have been reviewed for their relevancy (especially those using the terms *added entry*, *heading*, and *tracing*)” (*4JSC/CCC/9/LC response*). *LC/60* does not make that claim, and presumably *4JSC/CCC/9/LC response* refers to a review of the entire body of the rules rather than just the Glossary; this is reflected in the retention of a number of definitions that make sense only in a card catalog environment. The TF response assumes that the ALA position is unchanged, and has generally limited comments on main entry and the constellation of terms associated with it (*added entry*, *heading*, *tracing*) to issues of consistency. The TF recommends that ALA provisionally accept the LC definitions for main entry and related terms with the understanding that reconceptualizing them is still a work in progress.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC TERMS

Added entry. See comment at **Main entry**.

Analytical entry. It appears that the original definition encompassed both a separate bibliographic record and the analytical added entry. If so, the revision would seem to eliminate the latter. Note that the revision of **Entry** has a new definition 2. *An access point to a bibliographic or authority record.* On that basis, the definition of **Analytical entry** should account for analytical added entries as well. This does not mean that ALA necessarily endorses definition 1. See also TF remarks under **Main entry**.

The TF suggests:

Analytical entry. 1. A bibliographic record ~~An entry~~ for a part of a bibliographic resource ~~an item~~ for which a comprehensive record entry is also made. 2. A heading for a bibliographic resource contained in a more comprehensive resource, used as a secondary access point to a bibliographic record, and presented in the form by which the resource is to be uniformly identified and cited.

Bibliographic resource. A case could be made that the definition's introductory phrase "A generic entity that is ..." is superfluous. The definition would then read simply: "The object of a bibliographic description." One member has noted that the bibliographic description is not necessarily limited to the entity described; the shorter definition seems broad enough to include this insight, but an alternative might be "An entity that forms the basis for a bibliographic description."

Broadside. The TF believes that "manifestation" should be used rather than "bibliographic resource" since a broadside is an instance of a specific physical embodiment.

Chief source of information. JSC has accepted the definition in 1.0A3 in *4JSC/LC/59* and it will be in the 2004 revisions. Most of the TF thinks repetition of the definition in the Glossary is redundant. John Attig has pointed out that AACR generally prefers to define terms in the Glossary rather than the rules. With that reservation, the TF recommends that JSC consider withdrawing the definition.

Container. For syntactic consistency, change "part of any manifestation" to "part of a manifestation."

Edition. The TF believes ALA should continue to support retention of the term in the rules at this time; the rationale continues to be that stated in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/LC response/ALA response*. There is merit to the ACOC statement about "the need to revise the definition of edition, to consider what constitutes the same edition for different formats, and to relate these definitions to the definitions for expressions and manifestations" rather than drop the definition(s) for edition altogether as proposed by

LC. It is also noteworthy (considering the LC revision to the term **Item**) that LC would restore “copies” if the definitions are retained.

Format. See comment at **Physical carrier**.

Game. Since LC believes that **Kit** should be removed from the Glossary because the term corresponds to the dictionary definition, **Game** might also be considered for removal. Note that there are some reservations about whether the definition of **Kit** in fact corresponds to dictionary usage and the same reservations may apply to the **Game** definition.

Half title. LC removed *of a publication* to “simplify.” This change would broaden the scope to include unpublished material, which would seem to be an improvement.

Heading. Note that in the LC revision, **Heading** is an access point in authorized form, so “access point” and “heading” are not equivalent. Since LC states that the revision was intended to make the definition consistent with **Main entry**, the TF suggests that the definition will need further JSC discussion as part of the conversation re main entry, added entry and so on. The discussion would also extend to the LC proposal to add Part III on authority records to AACR2, since LC has not included a definition of “authorized.” Presumably “authorized form” means something like “the form by which the entry is uniformly identified and cited.” Whereas all entries are selected based on the rules in Part II, only a subset of the entries selected (**Headings**) need to be in a form requiring uniform identification and citation. What actually constitutes authorization will be determined by the forthcoming Part III, so ALA does not need to comment at this time.

Editorial note: the phrase “or reference to” in the revised definition should have commas around it.

Issue. Definition 2. The TF believes use of “issue” with multipart monographs is inappropriate and prefers to restrict its use to serials, the traditional application. In any case, it is unclear how the LC revision is FRBR-related.

LC:

Issue ... 2. One of the successive parts of a multipart monograph or of a serial. *See also* Impression, Reprint.

TF prefers:

Issue ... 2. One of the successive parts of a serial. *See also* Impression, Reprint.

Note also that LC has also added a sentence associating “issue” with multipart in the definition of **Part**; see TF comment.

Item. *4JSC/M/490-527, p. 13, minute 492.6* varied from the FRBR definition by including “or copy;” LC has removed the phrase and recommends explaining the use of “copy” in the rules in the new Introduction. The TF notes that copy/copies is not only

used in the rules but (perhaps more significantly) in a series of definitions in the Glossary, e.g. Definition 1. in the previous definition **Issue**. Although the use of the term could be explained in the Introduction, the failure to recognize in the Glossary itself that “copy” may be a synonym for “item” makes the definitions that use “copy” less understandable.

The TF believes that ALA can provisionally accept the LC strategy since this to some degree acknowledges ALA’s position that “copy” should be retained as an acceptable synonym for “item.” If the Introduction succeeds in clarifying how the term may be used, it may be that a definition or definitions of “copy” would then be more acceptable in the Glossary and even be restored to the definition of **Item**.

It is unclear why LC wants to make a reference to **Iteration**. Why not also to **Part** and **Issue**? We are not sure how this relates to FRBR in any case.

Kit. LC recommended deletion of **Kit** and **Multimedia** on the basis that the definitions are in the dictionary. This is consistent with AACR2 policy. Further, the definitions basically repeat the guidelines in 1.1C4 and the x1.C2 rules for assigning gmds, and use of these terms is restricted to these rules. The Consistency Task Force eventually may recommend converting the x1.C2 rules as references back to 1.1C4. However, there is some question as to whether the definitions (particularly definition 2.) do reflect dictionary usage or are in fact unique to AACR2. The TF recommends that LC verify that the definitions commonly used within the cataloging community reflect dictionary usage.

Main entry, Added entry, Tracing. ALA has not followed up on the April 2003 JSC request to identify where “entry” is used to mean “description” or “record.” This needs to be done before the April JSC meeting in order to begin discussion on the reconceptualization of these terms for the online environment.

Manifestation. Although the wording of the definition corresponds to the FRBR definition, the TF recommends that JSC consider whether the Glossary definition should clarify that “physical embodiment” includes “intangible.”

Mixed responsibility. LC revision follows the ALA proposal in *4JSC/Chair follow-up/4/LC Response/ALA response*, written to be consistent with the definition for **Shared responsibility**.

Multimedia resource. See comments on **Kit** above.

Musical presentation statement. Note that “edition” is also used in this definition. See the TF comment at **Edition**.

Other title information. The TF recommends that “manifestation” be used instead of “bibliographic resource.” If, as LC states, the title proper is a manifestation attribute, it would appear that, an **Other title** being dependent on (defined by its relationship to) a **Title proper**, then it follows that the **Other title** is also an attribute of manifestation.

Part. Based on the TF recommendation at **Issue** above, the LC revision of 2. should also be updated for consistency. The TF recommends deleting the entire sentence added by LC since definition 2. is intended to apply only to 2.5B17.

Physical carrier. Based on *4/JSC/Chair/Follow-up/4/Sec follow-up/LC response* it appears as if LC would prefer to replace “format” with “physical carrier” in a number of instances. Where LC recommends replacing “format” with “physical carrier” at 1.1C3, it appears that LC is including printed material within the scope of **Physical carrier**. In *CC:DA/TF/FRBR Terminology/7*, the TF had the following comment:

The current definitions, even in revised form, appear to use “format” in the broader sense, with “physical carrier” associated with non-print media. If JSC agrees to use “physical carrier,” [i.e. in 1.1C3] the TF believes that the definition for “physical carrier” needs to make it clear that printed material is also within scope.

Reference source. Replacing “publication” with “source” seems to be a sensible update, though not FRBR related.

Statement of responsibility. LC addressed ALA concerns a) and c) in *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/LC response/ALA response* by a) restoring “item” and c) deleting “of the item” at the end of the paragraph. However, the LC definition has retained the phrase “embodied in the manifestation.” ALA point b) was 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.

LC did not respond on this point in its comment. The ALA point is controversial even within the TF and hinges on whether a statement of responsibility can be construed as relating to an expression, since statements are generally understood to be an attribute of manifestations. The ALA point is that in the definition, the antecedent to the phrase is “persons with intellectual or artistic responsibility for the content,” so that the reference in context is at expression level. It may be that we’re at a stage where this is too fine a point to pursue; perhaps JSC should revisit it when the FRBRization of AACR2 is further along.

Text. LC's proposed change does not involve FRBR terminology; we prefer that this term and its definition not be revised at this time. There is concern that a change at this stage may inhibit discussion in the context of the SMD task force.

Text (large print). See comment above at **Text**.

Text (tactile). Presumably “material” means “class of material” in this definition; insert “a class of”?

A term used as a general material designation for a class of material intended for the visually impaired ...

Tracing: see **Main entry** above.

Volume.

Definition 1. JSC might consider replacing “division” with “component” in this definition, in line with *4JSC/Chair/76/Chair follow-up/4/LC response*. However, note use of the term “unit” or “units” in 2.5B17, the definitions for **Part**, and the second definition of **Volume**.

Definition 2. TF suggests using “physical” instead of “material” in the definitions, since the original LC response was to restrict scope of application of the term “material.”

Original definition:

2. In the material sense, all that is contained in one binding, portfolio, etc., whether as originally issued or as bound after issue.² The volume as a material unit may not coincide with the volume as a bibliographic unit.

TF suggestion:

In the physical ~~material~~ sense, all that is contained in one binding, portfolio, etc., whether as originally issued or as bound after issue.² The volume as a physical ~~material~~ unit may not coincide with the volume as a bibliographic unit.

Footnote 2.

LC version:

Such a composite volume may contain either two or more bibliographic volumes of the same work or manifestations of two or more works published independently.

TF suggests, for clarity:

Such a composite volume may contain either two or more bibliographic volumes of the same work, or manifestations of two or more independently published works ~~published independently~~.