

**Association for Library Collections and Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Classification Section**

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**TASK FORCE ON THE REVIEW
OF THE LOGICAL STRUCTURE
OF THE *ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES***

FINAL REPORT

Philip Schreur, Chair (August 1999)
Joan Schuitema, Chair (April-July 1999)
John C. Attig
George F. Johnston
John Kloswick
Mary L. Larsgaard
Ingrid Mifflin
Cecilia Sercan

**August 16, 1999
rev. September 17, 1999**

The Task Force on the Review of The Logical Structure of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules was charged with the detailed review of Parts One and Two of The Logical Structure of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules by Tom Delsey. The Task Force was instructed to focus on the key issues and recommendations contained in Delsey's logical analysis of AACR and not the structure of the model itself. The Delsey model is quite complex and the Task Force hopes it has done it justice in the short time it has had to compile a response to the recommendations contained therein.

Delsey undertook his analysis at the request of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR as an outgrowth of the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR (October 1997). The analysis Delsey provides is intended to be used to reveal the current structure of AACR and also as a logical starting point for its next developmental stage. In creating his analysis, Delsey confined himself to what was explicit or implicit in the code itself. A cataloger, of course, will bring a wealth of experience to his/her perception of the code and it is this context that informs his/her judgment in interpreting and applying the rules. It is this experience which has rightly been removed from Delsey's analysis, for even though it is an essential element in the code's interpretation, it may obscure the true logical structure of the code as written. This absence of interpretation and context, at times, makes the analysis seem artificial; but the result is a model that is thorough, exacting, and brutally direct.

As such, it is an excellent tool for revealing the structure of the code and for testing possible revisions. However, it will be necessary to evaluate such revisions against the knowledge gained by experience in applying and interpreting the code.

PART I

1. CLASS OF MATERIALS

Does the concept of class of materials as currently reflected in the code serve as a viable basis for an extended structure accommodating new forms of digital materials?

Delsey Recommendation: Use the model developed for this study to assess options for structuring Part 1 of the code to facilitate the integration of rules for new forms of expression and new media. One option for consideration would be to use ISBD(G) areas of description as the primary organizing element for the overall structure of Part 1.

Task Force Response: The Task Force agrees that this is a significant issue and a problem that must be addressed. The model presents convincing evidence that the chapters in Part I are based on a confusing mixture of intellectual content (and assumptions about the intellectual content), physical carrier, type of publication, published/unpublished status and other factors. The "CLASS OF MATERIALS" entity is fundamental to the rules – particularly relating to its function in rule 0.24. In an age when material that belongs to more than one class is increasingly common, conflicts in applying rule 0.24 are inevitable. The rules need to include a clear directive in what order and how the cataloger deals with the many facets of an item to be cataloged.

As to the recommendation, the Task Force notes that the CC:DA Task Force on Rule 0.24 has accepted the suggestion to reorganize Part I of the rules according to the ISBD(G) areas of description. This Task Force supports that recommendation.

In such a reorganized code, the “CLASS OF MATERIALS” entity could be deconstructed. Since it no longer defines a complete set of rules for describing the material in question (a separate chapter in Part I), distinct categories can be defined as the scope for each special rule. (These categories could still be called “classes of materials,” although it might be a good idea to use a new term.) Categories could be defined under each of the relevant facets (intellectual content, physical carrier, type of publication, etc.) for which there are special rules in the code. Special rules could thus be phrased “For [category], do [rule].” – and this explicit labeling would help catalogers to find the relevant special rules in each area. This should make the code easier to use.

The distinction between general and special rules is perhaps one of the benefits of the reorganization of the code. Some of us participated not long ago in “format integration” – the merging of the different USMARC bibliographic formats into a single format. In the course of this exercise, it was surprising in how many cases there were different specifications for the same data elements in different formats. The prototypes of reorganized chapters for Area 1 and Area 2 that are given in Appendix A of the report of the CC:DA Task Force on Rule 0.24 show that, despite our best collective efforts, the same situation occurs in AACR: rules that are probably intended to be applied to all relevant material, but are currently stated with slight variations in the different chapters. The editorial process of preparing a reorganized Part I will need to resolve all of these discrepancies and decide what should be a general rule and what should be the scope of each special rule. The result should be a code that is not only simpler, but also more consistent.

The prototypes referred to above suggest that the conflicts among special rules would not be frequent. In most cases, the applicable rules can be applied in sequence because they deal with different facets of the item (content and carrier, for instance). However, there will be cases in which conflicts will occur. The one case that comes most readily to mind are the rules for selecting the chief source – or, in the reorganized rules, the source for the title and statement of responsibility area. The current rules are again based on a mixture of intellectual content, physical carrier or other facets. If the current rules were simply brought together, then there would be conflicts for those items to which both a content-based rule and a carrier-based rule applied. This may be one of the aspects of Part I that will require the most careful substantive re-writing: determining which factors should be most important in selecting sources for transcription and developing an order of precedence.

Summary: This Task Force supports the reorganization of Part I of AACR into chapters for each ISBD(G) area of description. We feel that the result is likely to be a simpler and more consistent set of rules. The new rules should include a set of categories that cover all significant facets of the items to be described and for which there are special rules in the code.

2. PHYSICALITY

Does the physicality inherent in the concept of DOCUMENT constrain the logical development of the code to accommodate the cataloging of electronic resources?

Delsey Recommendation: Use the model developed for this study as the basis for examining the feasibility of modifying the internal logic of the code to accommodate documents that are defined in non-physical terms. Consultation should be undertaken with experts in the area of electronic document architecture.

Task Force Response: The Task Force suspects that this question is aimed at electronic resources available over the Web. Other electronic resources (e.g., a music CD) have had their data become fixed (i.e., uneditable) and closely tied to a physical carrier.

However, documents that are available over the Web are not without a type of physical existence as well. Even though an information resource is digital, it still must exist and be stored in at least one location. This physicality, however, is elusive as it cannot be perceived by our senses. As it cannot be readily perceived, changes to it cannot be detected directly. The instability of this medium becomes twofold. The stored data may become altered with no immediately perceived change to the display, and the same data may be displayed in alternate forms, giving the impression of differing documents. A true dilemma for a cataloger trying to determine the relationship between two items.

This confusion over the content/display of a digital document extends yet further to the definition of its “boundaries”. Does the content included by the hypertext links constitute part of the document? If these links are broken or the content of the hyperlinked material altered, has the document itself been altered? Are these alterations serious enough so that we should consider a new work has been created or trivial enough that these changes need not even be mentioned on the catalog record? Catalogers have become comfortable with the metaphysical nature of the “work”. Extending this concept to the document itself is counterintuitive. We allow certain variations in the expressions of the “work” to exist and still consider the work to be the same. Will we allow the same variance in the expressions of a document?

The Delsey model also shows that the code is “inconsistent”. For example, the logic does not always use physical existence as the determining factor in Area 5, at times the determining factor is intellectual content. The Task Force agrees. The rules for Area 5 in Chapter 2 make the assumption that an item is text in book or pamphlet form, black ink on white paper. And so, the intellectual content component of the document – that it is text – is never mentioned, only the extent of the carrier. Yet the specific material designations in AACR2 are a mixture of content types (such as “map”), carrier types (such as “sound recording”) and those that are both (such as “motion picture”). To be consistent in its treatment of all forms of content, Area 5 should always contain both the specific type of intellectual content and the specific type of carrier, as has been the practice for cartographic materials for many years. As new forms of

artistic expression and material type increase, and we are faced with organizing large numbers of digital resources available over the Web, the assumption that our bibliographic world will be predominantly printed text is no longer valid and the expression of those assumptions in AACR2 must be re-evaluated.

Summary: The Delsey report states that "... networked electronic resources ... effectively have no physical dimension." It might be more accurate to say that networked electronic resources have no STABLE physical dimension. It is this instability of storage and display, and the articulation of acceptable variance within the defined boundaries of an electronic resource that AACR2 needs to address. Delsey has picked up on a key assumption in the structure of the rules and a difficult, subtle problem to resolve.

3. PUBLISHED VS. UNPUBLISHED

Is the division of the universe of objects described into two categories - published and unpublished - adequate to accommodate the description of digital objects disseminated on-line?

Delsey Recommendation: Using the model developed for this study as a frame of reference, examine the issues raised with respect to the notion of "publication" in a networked context in consultation with experts in the area of electronic documents.

Task Force Response: Delsey's recommendation in this simple form makes sense, however, his expanded explanation is troublesome. Below are a few pertinent definitions from the report:

1. Production: the act of physically creating a document
2. Creation: the act of originating intellectual or artistic content
3. Manufacture: the act of making copies of a document by means of a mechanical or electronic process
4. Release: the act of making copies of a document available to the public

The "real world" entities that make up an unpublished document are, to a large extent, the same that make up a published document. The additional "real world" entities attached to a published document are: manufacture, release, copy, impression, issue, and edition.

The model fails to recognize a major change of flow with digital objects disseminated on-line. The acts relating to a physical object are active ones: publication, dissemination, manufacture. With digital objects, the transitive acts of production, manufacture, and release are replaced by the passive (to the document) aspect of access. The transitive aspects have been placed in the hands of the user rather than the producer. Even the realm of creation becomes blurry as electronic "documents" become broken down into constituent parts and are able to be reconstituted in unique combinations by individual researchers.

The vocabulary of the model, as it reflects AACR2 as currently written, has been designed to describe the production, manufacture, and release of physical items. The question posed is whether or not the dissemination of non-physical documents can be accommodated in this model. As the vocabulary, however, was not geared to adequately describe electronic documents, the fit can never be right. The vocabulary used determines the result. Delsey states "The question to be addressed, therefore, is whether the concepts underlying the entities defined

as RELEASE and COPY can be extended ...". Again, the assumption is the model will still apply with an extension of vocabulary.

The concept of copy in itself is equally confusing in digital documents. Digital documents, of course, do have a physical component in that they exist as stored information. However, this stored information may be displayed in various ways. If someone captures this display in a hard copy, is it the same item as the stored digital information? Another suite of problems centers around the ease with which the data that comprises the object may change and how this is related to your mode of access. A cataloger may catalog a digital item accessed remotely. The control of the content of this item is out of the hands of the accessing agency and may very well change with time. Obtaining a "copy" of the digital information may help an institution to fix it, but the original from which it was copied may continue to evolve and the two no longer contain similar content. What is the relationship between the two and how is this reflected in the catalog?

Another perplexing term is manufacture. For many digital objects disseminated online, the act of production and manufacture are the same: there may be only one copy of an item to which multiple users are allowed access (e.g., websites). Or, a resource may be manufactured in the traditional sense, and then the separate copies made available on-line to multiple users (e.g., Cataloger's Desktop). Perhaps the only valid distinction is made by "release"? If no access is allowed to an electronic item, should it be considered unpublished? Does the mere act of accessibility constitute publication (e.g., allowing networked access to a digital "copy" of a dissertation)? Where would the fixing (through downloading to a disk) of a networked serial resource that is meant to be continuously updated fit into the scheme?

Summary: The question posed by Delsey is an important one. However, his implied solution (expansion of current model vocabulary) is inadequate. The vocabulary of Delsey's model is simply not rich enough to capture the myriad of possibilities in the description of digital objects disseminated on-line. By merely enhancing the same terms used to discuss physical items in order to encompass digital objects, the result becomes artificial. Unless we are cautious, we will move from a set of outdated rules to an equally constrained model.

4. SERIALITY

Can the notion of “seriality” as reflected in the code be extended to accommodate electronic forms of “publication” or dissemination of documents “intended to be continued indefinitely”?

Delsey Recommendation: Continue the examination of the “seriality” issue initiated as a follow-up to the Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR2, using the frame of reference set out in the model developed for this study as a tool to assist in the analysis of the issues.

Task Force Response: This recommendation has been overtaken by subsequent events. The report on “Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality” has since been issued. It did not use the Delsey model to formulate or test its recommendations, but it does address most of the issues raised in Recommendation 4.

Specifically:

1. The Seriality report (by implication) transforms Type of Publication into Type of Issuance or Type of Release, thus removing the restriction to published material that is implicit in the current definition of “serial.”
2. The concept of seriality has been broadened to encompass all continuing items. However, the term “serial” is retained for successively-issued items, and a new category has been proposed for “integrating” items.
3. The definition of “serial” retains the concepts of successive issuance and intent to continue (“no predetermined conclusion”).
4. The requirement that serials be numbered has been removed, thus bringing unnumbered successively-issued items back within the scope of “serial.”
5. The problem of electronic journals that comprise a database of articles, but with no discrete issues, is to be solved by considering the discrete articles to satisfy the requirement for successive issuance. This addresses a problem raised in the Delsey report, but it does not accept the suggestion there to treat such items as integrating (“a single document intended to be continued indefinitely”).

The Seriality report does not address one of the issues raised in the Delsey report, which suggested that electronic transmission of digital objects needs to be worked into the concepts of publication, manufacture, release, copy, edition, etc. Current U.S. practice has been to propound the controversy as to whether or not electronic transmission should be treated as publication. Further work is clearly needed.

Summary: The Seriality report addresses the issues raised in this section of the Delsey report and provides a tight conceptual structure which is also workable in practice. The report does not squarely face one implication of its recommendations: the transformation of Type of Publication into Type of Release or Type of Issuance needs to be examined more carefully, as does the nature of electronic transmission as a form of publication.

5. CHANGE IN ATTRIBUTES OF A DOCUMENT

What are the implications of applying the logic of the code to documents in which the intellectual content is not permanently “fixed” within a physical object?

Delsey Recommendation: Review the conventions and rules for reflecting change in the attributes of an item described, as currently established, to determine their applicability to changes in the attributes of digital objects, and extend them as necessary to accommodate a broader range of variables.

Task Force Response: Internet resources can, and sometimes do, change frequently and, at times, quite drastically. There is no guarantee that the resource one sees on the screen today will be exactly the same tomorrow. This has several implications for descriptive cataloging.

First, how much can a document change before it must be considered a new document – even a new work? The boundaries between items now shift dynamically while we aren’t looking. The code needs to provide guidelines for determining how much change can be accommodated within a single bibliographic description, and when it is necessary to make a new description. The LC Rule Interpretation for rule 1.0 gives some guidelines on determining if a given item is a new edition, or just a copy (with perhaps some modifications) of an existing item. AACR2 and the rule interpretation assume, however, that one has ready access to the various versions of the item, or at least to their surrogates (the catalog records). With digital documents, however, in most cases, the new version completely replaces the old version of the document, and thus the original “document” no longer exists as a separate entity. Even the bibliographic description for that original document may not have sufficient information to determine if what we see now is a new work or a new expression or not.

It seems important that AACR2 be revised to accommodate this reality of digital documents, giving guidelines on how much a document might change before it must be considered an entirely new item. The CC:DA Task Force on Rule 0.24 has done some good work on this issue, and we support its recommendation that guidelines on when to create a new record be added to the code. It is important that such guidelines be applicable to all materials, but also be able to deal with the challenges of digital materials. The concept of acceptable variance is an important one to consider across all types of materials, and the resulting guidelines should be consistent across material boundaries.

Second, within a single bibliographic description, how should changing data be reflected? Delsey provides a good summary of the existing techniques and recommends an analytical approach towards the question. He suggests identifying the attributes that change and then organizing them (and the rules) in such a manner that future revisions to the code will be minimized. We would add that the changing attributes and the nature of the changes also need to be evaluated for their significance to users, so that the need for revisions to bibliographic

records themselves will be minimized and confined to those attributes that are truly significant. This analytical and evaluative approach constitutes a positive step towards keeping the code viable and relevant for meeting future needs.

PART II

It should be noted that in Part 2 of his report, Delsey organized his Key Issues and Recommendations differently. In Part 1, Delsey followed each Key Issue with a Recommendation. In Part 2, by contrast, he begins by listing the Key Issues (six), which are followed by a discussion, and finally a list of Recommendations (seven). The Task Force has decided to organize its response around the Key Issues and their discussion. If a particular Key issue corresponded to a particular Recommendation(s), the Delsey Recommendation was included as well.

1. FUNCTIONS OF THE CATALOGUE

Delsey Recommendation: Using the model developed for this study as a frame of reference, develop a specification for the functions of the catalogue that fully articulates the objectives underlying the rules in the code that relate to the choice of access points and the construction and use of uniform titles. The tables used in Chapter 7 of the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* might serve as a model for structuring the specifications.

Task Force Response: Delsey's recommendation is an essential one and his suggestion for resolution very useful. Assuming the functions of the catalog are based on the Paris Principles of 1961 is logical. The functions of the catalog in the Paris Principles, however, are stated broadly. By contrast, the tables in Chapter 7 of the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* are very detailed. They develop specifications to allow a user to: Find manifestations, Find a particular manifestation, Identify a work, Identify an expression, Identify a manifestation, Select a work, Select an expression, Select a manifestation, and Obtain a manifestation. The tables are divided into three columns: "To enable the user to—" / "the basic level national bibliographic record should reflect these logical attributes and relationships—" / "and should include these specific data elements." The structure is clear and the model practical for developing specifications for the functions of the catalog.

2. THE CONCEPT OF "AUTHORSHIP"

Delsey Recommendation: Re-assess the concept of "authorship" as it relates to the functions of the catalogue, and determine whether the exceptions in the rules that limit the assignment of access points in certain instances (including the "rule of three") should be altered.

Delsey Recommendation: Assess the need to reflect additional relationships between persons and corporate bodies and the content of an item in the context of newly emerging forms of intellectual and artistic expression and multimedia productions.

Task Force Response: Delsey's comments center around the concept of authorship as defined in Chapter 21 of AACR2 and the articulation of the functions of the catalog as set out in the Paris Principles of 1961. The Principles state that the catalog should be an efficient instrument for identifying whether a library holds a particular item by an author (2.1(a)) and which items by a particular author the library holds (2.2(a)). An examination of the concept of "authorship" in Chapter 21 in light of these principles reveals two problem areas. First, exceptions are made to the entries one would expect based on the definitions of single, shared, and mixed personal authorship. Delsey suggests these exceptions need to be examined and a rationale developed to explain them, so that this pattern of exception can be expanded to new forms of production (e.g., multimedia works).

Second, Delsey notes certain added entries are made (performers, compilers, etc.) which are not required by the Paris Principles' statement on the function of the catalog. If these entries are to be made, one needs to develop guidelines as to what types of relationships (outside of authorship) should be reflected in the added entries as specified by the code. Again, reasoned principles need to be developed so that they can be logically extended to other forms of intellectual and artistic expression as they emerge.

The concept of "authorship" is a complex one in AACR2, not only in itself but also for the function it serves in the catalog. Various communities involved in access to information have used terms such as "originator," "agent," and "creator" to express the many facets of this concept, for "authorship" not only dictates how differing works will be entered into the catalog but also how different manifestations of the same work will be related. The rules must not only define authorship, but also consider authorship in relationship to the "work" and its collocating function. Any consideration of authorship must not only consider "choice" of access point but the purposes behind this choice. Further confusing the picture, the rules for authorship of works of mixed responsibility in particular show irregularities because they are often driven by format rather than content, a particular problem for developing media. Further guidance in this area is essential.

The limitations to access imposed by the rule of three appear questionable. Indeed, the rule of three can lead to inconsistencies in citation of versions of a work. Even the justification based on limiting the number of added entries in a card catalog is, for the most part, no longer valid. However, there are more practical matters to consider. The creation of controlled access points in a bibliographic record is the most expensive portion of the cataloging process. Many libraries now belong to the NACO/BIBCO programs and are held to a high standard of bibliographic record production and authority record creation. The cost of these added access points would not be insignificant. Any thorough review of authorship in AACR2 must concern itself with consistency, collocation, and cost.

Any sort of response to Delsey's second concern is intimately tied to the definition of a work and the report of the Task Force on 0.24, and also the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*. The Paris Principles seem to be working at a very high level, that is, the need to identify particular works in a catalog. The *Functional Requirements* extend these principles to the level of manifestation. If a function of the catalog is to allow a user to find a particular manifestation, certain additional access must be given and the *Functional Requirements* attempt to list what these elements are. However, the work of the Task Force on rule 0.24 has offered, among various options, Option C, which moves in a different direction than does the *Functional Requirements* document. CC:DA voted to recommend (a) a modified Option C and (b) that the modified Option C be used as a starting point for further, wider discussions. The recommended Option C, as modified by CC:DA, would indeed support the Paris Principles requirement of identifying

individual works in a catalog but not necessarily the *Functional Requirements* statement that one should be able to find particular manifestations. Of course, what a cataloger creates and what the online catalog displays need not be the same. There needs to be a clear distinction between expectations of record creation and expectations of record access and display.

The added entries which Delsey calls into question fall into different categories. Some, like performers, are intimately connected to the concept of an expression of a work and arguably should be considered as authors. Others are needed to identify a particular expression (e.g., compilers and editors), and others provide useful access points that are difficult to characterize in general terms (addressees of festschrifts).

In order to resolve the complex issues surrounding these “non-author” entries, we first need to articulate the functions of the catalog and then define the functional requirements for bibliographic records needed to support these functions. Only then could we articulate broad guidelines and remove ourselves from specific rules for specific formats.

3. THE CONCEPT OF THE “WORK”

Delsey Recommendation: Using the model as a frame of reference, test the feasibility of developing and articulating principles relating to the identity of the work or works manifested in the content of an item that can be applied at a more generalized level than is currently reflected in the specifics of the rules for choice of entry.

Task Force Response: The “concept of the work” is, of course, one of the most crucial discussions taking place at this time. As the code itself lacks a definition of “work”, Delsey has taken his from the *ALA glossary of library and information science*, noting the great similarity between this definition and the definition for “content” used in his model. One cannot help but sense a bit of wry humor as Delsey looks to the rules for main and added entries and the formulation of uniform titles for inferences “about the operative meaning of the term ‘work’ and its implicit boundaries.” What follows is an exposition on one of the most labyrinthine sections of AACR.

The need “to develop and articulate principles relating to the identity of the work or works manifested in the content of an item” is an essential one. In his most expansive comments, Delsey lays out choices of main entry for works of single, shared, and mixed responsibility. Further complexities are noted for performing, editing, or augmenting a previously existing work. Last, the myriad issues in determining main entry for collections with or without a collective title are detailed. Admittedly, the boundaries of a work and of its various kinds of editions – such as revised text or merely different typography – can be fuzzy, and some arbitrariness is necessary in determination. However, these rules betray a piecemeal approach to the resolution of this problem and a leaning towards resolution by format. Delsey rightly notes the concepts behind this list of exceptions must be analyzed and coordinated if we ever hope to create “general” rules that can be applied to emerging forms of publication and expression. The end result would be more manageable rules that require fewer exceptions of a specific nature.

Caution must be taken in this exercise, however, not to allow the operative meaning of “work”, if it can be ferreted out at all, to define “work” in the abstract. The issues are related yet separate. We need a rigorous examination of the rules to demonstrate how the concept of “work” has been used up till now, with a clear exposure of the conflicts thus far codified. We need to define for ourselves, however, the concept of work on which AACR should be based, and use the analysis the modeling has exposed for its clear, consistent expression in the rules.

Delsey Recommendation: Re-assess the current restrictions imposed by the application of the “rule of three” on the identification of individual works in items containing collections of works by different persons or bodies.

Task Force Response: The inclusion of “the rule of three” in AACR2 is related to the amount of staff time required for authority work and to the production of catalog cards, both very practical aspects of cataloging. There were practical limitations on the amount of information that could be typed on the catalog cards before the size of the catalog record(s) became unwieldy and took up too much space in the catalog drawers. In addition to the question of the size of the catalog card was the time consuming job of actually typing the catalog cards and the headings thereon. Today most libraries have eliminated catalog cards. Cataloging is done online using bibliographic utilities and the cataloging records reside in OPACs. Hence the practical aspects relating to catalog card production and maintenance are mainly eliminated with regards to “the rule of three”.

The time spent on authority work to authenticate and establish authority records associated with a cataloging record is still an issue and an important consideration when discussing authorship as well as “the rule of three”. The new electronic metadata schemes developed on the internet have made it possible to retrieve and create data elements directly from the electronic document and use them in the cataloging record(s). This may ease somewhat the workload concerns related to the creation of an authority record, but the establishment and authentication of the heading is still important in this environment.

As the OPACs and the internet mature the demand for easy and extensive access to documents both in online and in hard copy versions is rapidly increasing. The limitations enforced by “the rule of three”, as well as other special AACR2 rules of authorship, do not make much sense in this online environment, nor do they meet the demand of the information seeker of today, if they ever did. Clearly, it is in the users’ best interest to have access to each person or body having to do with the intellectual content and production of an item being cataloged.

The above-mentioned issues are all very practical issues. In AACR2 the rules for diffuse authorship are very complicated. The complex nature of the issues is clearly demonstrated in the Delsey report, especially when looking at the figures in Part 2. These figures model the rules for choice of main entry. It takes 16 figures to describe “Entry under personal name heading (Figures 3a-3p)”. However, all of these intricate rules in AACR2 and the accompanying LC interpretations pay some attention to the practical consideration of the limitations of catalog cards and time involved in doing authority work. In today’s information environment, aspects of these considerations are becoming outdated. The AACR2 rules for authorship are often very difficult to interpret and implement. Therefore, it seems very appropriate to review these rules concerning authorship for improvements which will work well in the online environment. The logic in the Delsey report works well as a tool to map the current application of “the rule of three” and to reassess the current restrictions imposed by this rule (as well as broader issue of the complexity of the rules for authorship) described in AACR2.

4. THE CONCEPT OF “EDITION”

Task Force Comment: In referring to the Paris Principles once more, the catalog should allow the user to identify “which editions of a particular work are in the library.” The vocabulary indicates an edition is “the embodiment of a work in a particular typographical form” and that “different editions may embody an identical or varying texts.” It must be understood that a

priori one must define the concept of “work”. Care should be taken about applying this part of the Paris Principles to Web resources in particular, since typography is not one of the elements that authors/publishers can control in a Web environment.

Delsey’s comments focus on the use of uniform titles as a collocating device for bringing together various editions of the same work, as well as separating distinct editions of that work. He rightly notes exceptions in the rules which allow what might be considered editions of the same work to be entered under different main entries (e.g., revisions of texts). These exceptions do need to be analyzed to see if the exceptions provided for should be further generalized, or, perhaps, eliminated.

The uniform title itself, and the many functions it must serve (i.e., identifying, organizing, distinguishing, etc.), is in need of further logical modeling. Perhaps the uniform title is not the best mechanism for achieving all these ends?

It is tempting to make a connection here to the citation form of a work. If, however, the catalog’s aim is to identify which editions of a particular work are in a library, this collocation may take place from added as well as main entries. At times, the exceptions in AACR appear to be a compromise between the need for explicit, practical rules for transcription and the need to embrace larger concepts of organization. It is extremely valuable to be able to note where illogical exceptions have been made in the rules and to re-evaluate them. But any revision must still keep in mind the need that drove the exception.

5. THE CITATION FORM OF A WORK

Delsey Recommendation: Using the model developed for this study, re-examine the use of the citation form as it is developed in the code to determine whether it is an optimally effective device for reflecting work-to-work relationships in the catalogue in light of the technology currently available to support bibliographic databases.

Task Force Response: This recommendation raises two distinct issues:

1. Is the author/title citation the best way to express work-to-work relationships in bibliographic databases?
2. Do the specific rules for main entry and for uniform titles provide for a consistent citation form for works?

The expression of relationships within the catalog needs to be analyzed (as the Delsey report suggests) “in the context of a shared cataloguing environment.” At the present time, our global bibliographic system works through the communication of discrete self-sufficient records. All relationships between records have to be expressed through the data contained in those records. Although it is possible within a given catalog to link related records directly (e.g., through control-numbers), it is difficult at this time to communicate these links beyond the system in which they were created. So we need a consistent, objective means of expressing relationship that can be translated to any catalog into which the records are loaded. And in order for this link to be generated and understood universally, the information that generates the link must be held within or constructed from the item being cataloged itself, in contrast to an element that is supplied by a local system.

The author/title citation is not the only possible means of doing this. The primacy of the author is definitely a cultural artifact. However, in the Anglo-American world, author/title citation is a familiar and usable concept – both for catalogers and for users. To abandon the author/title citation for this type of linking would introduce further complexity to the bibliographic record and have unknown ramifications in the world of those that use the catalog.

The need for a consistent, objective citation for a given work (and indeed for a given expression or manifestation) depends on a consistent set of rules for both choice of main entry and establishing uniform titles. The Delsey report has identified an embarrassing number of exceptional cases in which special rules have overruled general principles, and the choice of main entry depends, not on the nature of the work or the expression, but on attributes of particular manifestations (e.g., the order of authors names on a title page). The optionality of the rules for uniform titles – and indeed cases in which the rules specify that a uniform title *not* be made – is also a problem. These exceptions should indeed be examined and either – as the report recommends – be generalized or – perhaps better – be eliminated. It should be noted that many of these exceptions occur in what Gorman would term the “case-law” portions of Chapters 21 and 25.

Once these work-to-work relationships are clearly defined and appropriate links established, one could use current technology to create various types of displays which would express these relationships much more clearly than is currently in practice.

6. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE RULES FOR CHOICE OF ENTRY

Delsey Recommendation: Examine the feasibility of re-structuring the rules in Chapter 21 with a view to simplifying the use of the rules and facilitating the application of general rules to particular cases in the absence of rules dealing specifically with the case in question.

Task Force Response: In his analysis of rules for choice of entry, Delsey skillfully charts the growing confusion from a simple choice in works of single authorship (author or title) to twenty entities on which the main entry may be based in the case of works of mixed responsibility. Among other issues, Delsey asks if the line between works of shared and mixed responsibility is sufficiently clear. He also notes many of the rules for works of mixed responsibility are format based and one must extrapolate beyond them to include other forms of media not explicitly mentioned.

Very similar thoughts were expressed by the CC:DA Task Force on Works Intended for Performance. The Task Force notes most rules in Chapter 21 on mixed responsibility are based on format rather than on conditions of authorship and that there are no rules in general for mixed responsibility in new works. Both Delsey and the Task Force focused their attention on works of mixed responsibility.

The Task Force on Works Intended for Performance makes some excellent recommendations on rules that need to be examined and perhaps rewritten. If this is the direction that is taken, this report can make a good starting point. Delsey, however, moves in another direction. He questions the usefulness of the primary categories for works of shared and mixed responsibility and suggests a simpler approach based purely on number of people having responsibility for the content of the item. This approach has the benefit of extensibility to any medium but is perhaps too simplistic. Certainly other factors are more or equally

important. If this decision point were chosen, the remaining crucial issue would be how much impact one would need to have on the item to be included as having responsibility for it. Again, one is thrown back to the issues surrounding “work”. Once this key issue has been resolved, others, like the structure of Chapter 21, may fall more easily into place.