

**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 *Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality:*
*Rule Revision Proposals***

Report

(August 20, 2001)

Please note that the purpose of this document is to facilitate the work of the Committee and to provide a means for outreach to both library and non-library cataloging communities. This document is intended for the exclusive use of CC:DA and its cataloging constituencies, and is presented for discussion in the ongoing process of rule revision. Under no circumstances should the information here be copied or re-transmitted without prior consultation with the current Chair of CC:DA.

Introduction

The Task Force on the Review of Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals has continued to review the revised drafts of the Chapter 12 revisions and the comments from JSC members.

The Task Force reviewed the following documents:

- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/2, the clean copy of Chapter 12 and related rules, incorporating the decisions made at the April 2001 JSC meeting (with some additional points requiring decisions); in our comments below, this document is identified as “[clean copy]”.
- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/2/CCC response; in our comments below, this document is identified as “[CCC response]”.
- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/2/LC response: in our comments below, this document is identified as “[LC response]”
- 4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/ALA response/ALA follow-up/LC response, the LC response to the ALA proposal for rule 21.30L2; identified in our comments below as “[21.30L2]”.

The comments below are arranged in a single sequence of rule numbers following the order in the clean draft. Each comment identifies the applicable rule number and the document in which it appears.

The Task Force was again assisted by the comments provided by members of the ALCTS Serials Section Committee to Study Serials Cataloging. We thank them for their contribution.

General Assumptions and Recommendations

1. We commend the CCC and LC reviewers for their thorough and careful review of the text. **We support all of their comments, except as noted below.**
2. In the present review, we have assumed that a definite decision has not yet been made as to whether the draft Appendix on Major Differences and Changes is to supersede the revisions to Chapter 21 contained in the clean copy. On the contrary, we have assumed that those revisions to Chapter 21 contain the rules for title changes that need to be consistent with the rules in Chapter 12. We note that if the Appendix is approved for the same revision package as Chapter 12, then considerable work will need to be done to merge the two sets of revisions and to make sure that the rules in Chapter 12 are consistent with the provisions of the Appendix; clearly, this is not yet the case. If the Appendix is not included in the Feb. 2002 revision package, then the process of merging it into the rest of the rules can take place later. We recommend that, during their review of both sets of documents prior to the October 2001 JSC meeting, JSC members consider whether it is feasible to include the Appendix in the Feb. 2002 revision package and further, what changes to other rules would be needed in order to make this possible.

Specific Comments

- ✓ **12.0A1** [clean copy, CCC response, LC response]: (a) We support the CCC suggestion to add "updating Web sites". (b) ALA intended to make the same point as LC about the exception for cartographic materials. The deletion of that statement received general support from CC:DA, including a strong statement from Elizabeth Mangan, the MAGERT representative. (c) We support the LC reorganization of the rule.
- ✓ **12.0B1a** [LC response]: We support moving the instructions regarding electronic serials that do not retain their previous titles. However, we suggest simplified language: "... treat it as an integrating resource ..." Also change 21.2C1a to "... treat the electronic serial as an integrating resource ..."
- ✓ **12.0B2 footnote 1** [clean copy]: ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials has asked that we comment on the continued use of the term "oriental" in this and other rules in AACR. The terms "Orient" and "Oriental" were Western inventions. When applied to persons of Asian and/or African descent, the term (at least in the United States) may cause offense. When used as a geographic term, it has no precise location that is generally agreed upon. For these reasons, we recommend that alternative language be found. At the moment, the CC:AAM is investigating the actual scope of the

rules involved. We hope to have a proposal for the ALA representative to bring to the October JSC meeting.

For the record, the term “Orient” occurs only in titles used as examples; the term “Oriental” occurs in:

- 2.0B2 (sources of information)
- 2.5B12 (double leaves)
- 12.0B1 (sources of information)
- 21.30K1 (works – translators)
- 24.5C3 (language)
- Appendix C.5 (numbers)
- Glossary: Chinese style, Double leaf, and Traditional format (Oriental books)

- ✓ **12.1B1** [clean copy]: In the second paragraph “Correct obvious typographic errors” we would expect to see “typographical errors.” This phrase does not occur elsewhere in AACR2 and there is no clear pattern of usage for “typographic/al” in the rules. What is the preferred usage?
- ✓ **12.1B8a and b** [clean copy]: The use of the phrase “in general” is confusing in both subrules. We think that the intent is to allow discretion and that the usual language is “if considered to be important.” We therefore suggest that the final clause of subrule a) be changed to “give the later title in a note if considered to be important ...” and in subrule b) to “and give the earlier title in a note if considered to be important ...”
- ✓ **12.1B8** [CCC response, LC response]: We prefer the more specific references proposed by LC.
- ✓ **12.1E1b** [clean copy]: In the example, the diacritic over the a in “coletanea” should be a circumflex, not a tilde.

Legislação estudantil [GMD] : coletânea de leis, decretos, resoluções e pareceres
- ✓ **12.1F3a** and elsewhere [LC response]: We agree with LC that JSC should sort out the distinction between “considered necessary by the cataloguing agency” and “considered to be important”; we also agree that this isn’t the time to do this and that JSC needs to maintain list of deferred issues.
- ✓ **12.2F1** [LC response]: We agree with LC that this and other rules need to be re-examined in the light of the Appendix on Differences and Changes. As noted above, this may be a question of timing; the question of consistency depends on when the Appendix is approved.
- ✓ **12.3B1/12.3C4** [clean copy]: We agree with LC that the “PP1” example illustrates 12.3C4 since it turns out that “75” does represent the year. However, we wonder whether this example adds anything useful to the examples at 12.3C4. If it is retained, we would recommend that the parenthetical explanation be deleted since it adds nothing to the example itself.

- ✓ **12.3C1** [clean copy]: The 5th (International commercial television rate and data book) and 7th (Biennial report) examples show that exact transcription has not been given; what the examples show is, in fact, the format specified in the ANSI/NISO holdings standard (Z39.71-1999). We ask what conclusions should be drawn from these examples. If a standard is implied or preferred, we would recommend an explicit reference. If the fact that these examples follow this standard is a coincidence, is it one that JSC is willing to see interpreted as support for the standard? — as it seems inevitable will happen.
- ✓ **12.3C4** [clean copy]: Please consider the following revision of the 2nd paragraph:

However, if the designation consists of a year and dependent numbering, give the year before such numbering.

If that is the intent of the rule, we feel that the concept of dependent numbering helps clarify the application of this rule.
- ✓ **12.4D2** [CCC response, LC response]: CCC and LC both note the discrepancy between “publisher, distributor, etc.,” and “publisher, etc.” in this rule. We find the CCC revision to be more consistent with AACR conventions. However, at some future time, it might be worthwhile to look at simplifying the terminology used to identify Area 4.
- ✓ **12.4F2, 1.4F8** [clean copy]: The examples illustrating the omission of the date when the first and/or last issue or part or iteration is not available end without punctuation. The U.S. (CONSER) practice is to omit the date, but to give the punctuation that precedes the date element — i.e., a comma. The comma serves as a visual cue to serials catalogers that the description is for a continuing resource, but that the first or last issue was not available. We believe that this practice is useful and is a valid interpretation of the punctuation rules for Area 4. If that is the case, then we would recommend that the comma be added at the end of the 2nd and 3rd examples under 12.4F2a and the first example under the 2nd paragraph of 1.4F8.
- ✓ **12.5D2** [clean copy, LC response]: We support the LC comments, which take account of a later state of the Chapter 3 revisions than their statements in the clean copy.
- ✓ **12.6B1** [CCC response]: We do not support the CCC revision; we find “numberings” much more confusing than “numbering” in this context.
- ✓ **12.7B1** [clean copy]: The phrase “unless it is apparent from the content of the title and statement of responsibility area” does not reflect current U.S. serial cataloging practice. This element is so important for serials control that it is always given even if redundant with other data in the record. We would prefer to change to “Make notes on the frequency of the serial or the frequency of updates to the integrating resource if known.”
- ✓ **12.7B1** [CCC response]: We support the CCC examples, but suggest that the “Rev. ed. issued every 4 months” might need explanation. It might help to label this as applying to an integrating resource. In that context, we are not sure whether “edition” is an appropriate term to use for a revised iteration of an integrating resource. Finally, there are two possible ways to interpret this note: either this is a regularly-updated integrating

resource or the “Rev. ed.” is a serial appearing four times a year; we doubt that the latter is intended, but that is a possible way of reading the example.

- ✓ **12.7B2** [LC response]: We take LC’s point that other rules use commas where we have proposed semicolons. We continue to believe that the semicolon is clearer and we would like to see these examples changed. As contradictory examples can be identified, we would like to see them corrected as well; however, since these rules are now being revised, we are limiting our suggestions to these rules.
- ✓ **12.7B4.2b** [clean copy]: We repeat our objection to “Oct.? 1979” in the 2nd example. It may be technically correct and we may be able to explain what the question mark means, but it isn’t intuitively obvious in reading the example and it isn’t a critical point about the application of this rule. May we please find another example or simply delete the question mark?
- ✓ **12.7B5.2**, etc. [CCC response, LC response]: This is the first of a number of rules to which CCC proposes to add “If the changes have been numerous, give a general note.” LC prefers “make a general statement.” We do not have a strong preference between these choices, although “general statement” does seem to be used elsewhere in the rules. However, we are not convinced in every case that this instruction should be added. We strongly recommend caution in giving catalogers encouragement to omit details of changes simply because they are numerous. Some of the changes involved are in fact major changes in the draft appendix, a contradiction that will have to be resolved. We would definitely prefer case-by-case consideration of this instruction. And we feel that such instructions may be more appropriate in the integrating resources subrules than in the serials subrules. With regard to 12.7B5.2, we support the addition of this instruction in the rules for parallel titles.
- ✓ **12.7B7.2b** [CCC response]: We disagree with adding the instruction to make a general statement. To the extent that changes in statements of responsibility involve the choice of main entry for an integrating resource and also relate to the way the resource may have been cited, we do not think that catalogers should be encouraged to omit notes and added entries for any responsible person or body that might serve as a primary access point to the resource (i.e., that might have been chosen as main entry). Changes in statements of responsibility that do not raise issues of main entry could be summarized in a general statement, but the frequency of the changes should not be the primary factor in determining when to make such a general statement.
- ✓ **12.7B8e** [clean copy, CCC response, LC response]: In the clean copy, the explanation of the example reads “Original resource being cataloged in Russian)”. CCC suggests “Original resource being catalogued is in Russian)”; this isn’t quite correct, because the original resource ISN’T what is being cataloged. LC suggests going back to “Title proper in Russian)”; this won’t do because the resource itself is in Russian, not just the title proper. We suggest turning the whole thing around:

(Resource being catalogued is translation of Russian original)

- ✓ **12.7B9.2** [CCC response]: We do not disagree with the CCC recommendation to add an instruction to make a general note summarizing frequent changes in edition statements — so long as it is clear (particularly in the case of integrating resources) that

this is **only** done after it has been determined that none of the changes in edition statement requires the creation of a new record. In other words, the Appendix on Major Differences and Changes (and, until this is approved, the definition of edition in the AACR glossary) needs to be a part of the application of this rule. We do not have specific text to propose, but we urge that an explicit statement be added to emphasize that differences in edition statements normally require a new record and that only minor differences may be given in notes.

- ✓ **12.7B14.2a and b** [CCC response]: We disagree with adding “If the changes have been numerous, give a general note” to these two rules. Catalogers should not be encouraged to omit notes and added entries for any series in which issues/parts/iterations of a title have appeared. See 12.7B5.2 for general comments on such general statements.
- ✓ **12.7B23** [clean copy, LC response]: In the 2nd example under i) Numbered serials, “No.” should be consistently capitalized. If the first occurrence is capitalized, the second should be as well.
- ✓ **12.7B23** [LC response]: We support the LC rearrangement and rewording. We suggest, however, that the word “itself” be deleted from the first line of section II) Unnumbered serials. We also wonder, without suggesting a change, about the conditional clause in this section. If the point is to distinguish the description of the unnumbered serial from the treatment of the serial title as a series added entry on records for items in the series, then we question whether a cataloger would ever look at this rule without already having decided in favor of the former.
- ✓ **1.0F** [clean copy]: In the final sentence, change “of a serial or an integrating resource” to “of a continuing resource”.
- ✓ **1.1B1** [CCC response]: CCC questions whether “Beauty” in “Sleeping Beauty” should be capitalized and suggests maybe a less controversial example. We are confident that Beauty is part of the character’s name — is **in fact** the character’s name — and therefore should be capitalized.
- ✓ **1.4F8** [clean copy]: The beginning of the 2nd paragraph should read “If the first and/or last published issue ...” because the rule covers the possibility that neither is available. The next clause reads “do not give the beginning or ending date”; is “and” needed there as well or would that add to the confusion?
- ✓ **Chapter 9** [LC response]: LC reiterates the JSC decision to remove information/examples for integrating resources from Chapter 9 and give them only in Chapter 12. Without disagreeing with any of the specific changes in the clean copy, we would like to offer the following clarification. What should appear **only** in Chapter 12 are instructions dealing specifically with integrating resources and examples supporting those instructions. Examples that just happen to be integrating resources as well as electronic resources are appropriate in chapter 9 when they support instructions dealing with the electronic aspect of an integrating electronic resource. There are also cases in which the specific rule addresses neither the electronic nor the integrating aspects; in such cases, there should be no objection to any appropriate example.

- ✓ **21.2A2** [CCC response]: We have no strong objection to being consistent about singulars and plurals; on the other hand, we have no strong desire to make the change.
- ✓ **21.3B1** [clean copy]: The use of the term “entry” in this rule is troubling. This use of “entry” where catalogers today would say “record” or “description” is common in the current text of AACR2. However, this is an area in which the Appendix on Major Differences and Changes will introduce a different set of concepts and terminology and editorial work will be needed to reconcile it with the current text. If this revision is to be published before the Appendix is incorporated into the rules, we suggest that “description” be used in instructions relating to changes in integrating resources. Thus the second sentence in 21.3B1b should read “Instead, change the description to reflect the latest information ...” (This parallels the language at 21.2C1b.)
- ✓ **21.30L2** [21.30L2]: ALA continues to support our proposal. We take LC’s point that 21.30L1 does not explicitly exclude added entries for any series past, present or future. We also note that in 6.7B12 and 11.7B12 there are examples of notes on series in which previous editions of the work have appeared. However, this is a slightly different case because the only series statement that ever existed has disappeared into the ether. Catalogers being literal minded folks are bound to wonder whether they can still make the added entry, even if 21.30L1 doesn’t forbid it. We would prefer to make an explicit statement in the rules rather than waiting for the rule interpretation. We would have no objection to adding text to 21.30L2 to include other cases such as those in 6.7B12 etc.
- ✓ **Glossary** [CCC response]: We oppose the addition of “iteration” to the glossary defined as “One of the renderings of an integrating resource.” If this definition is accepted, ALA would undoubtedly feel the need to propose a definition of “rendering” — and probably of whatever synonym is used to define rendering. “Iteration” is an indefinable concept. If the point of the CCC request is to make sure that we know that iterations apply to integrating resources, then the solution is to make sure that this is clear in the scope of every rule using that term — which we believe it already is in most cases.

Addendum

1.4F8 [clean copy]: In our comments on the proposed definition of "iteration," we noted that it might help if each rule using of the term "iteration" made it clear that the term applied to integrating resources. We note one rule in which this is not yet the case — the rules on dates in area 4.

Rule 1.4F8, etc. is captioned "Dates for serials, integrating resources, and multipart items" and the rule begins "If the first published issue, iteration, or part is available ..." Similar language is used elsewhere in this rule. To be pedantically precise, these rules should refer to *the first and/or last issue or part of a serial, the earliest and/or latest iteration of an integrating resource, or the first and/or last part of a multipart item*. This language is precise, but it is also very lengthy and may not be clear when embedded in an already extensive rule. We ask JSC to consider how precise these rules ought to be. As a guide to making this decision, here is a marked up copy of the rule with the full text above inserted.

1.4F8. Dates for serials, integrating resources, and multipart items. If the first published issue or part of a serial, the earliest iteration of an integrating resource, or the first part of a multipart item is available, give the beginning date followed by a hyphen. If the resource has ceased or is complete and the last published issue or part of a serial, the latest iteration of an integrating resource, or the last part of a multipart item is available, give the ending date, preceded by a hyphen. If the first and last published issues or parts of a serial, the earliest and latest iterations of an integrating resource, or the first and last parts of a multipart item are available, give the beginning and ending publication dates, separated by a hyphen. If the publication date is the same for all issues or parts of a serial, iterations of an integrating resource, or parts of a multipart item, give only that date as the single date. For an updating loose-leaf, supply the date of the last update if considered important.

[Examples as in clean copy]

If the first and/or last published issue or part of a serial, the earliest and/or latest iteration of an integrating resource, or the first and/or last part of a multipart item is not available, do not give the beginning or ending date; give information about the beginning or ending date in a note if it can be readily ascertained (see 1.7B9, 12.7B11.1).

[Examples and rest of rule as in clean copy]

Task Force members

John C. Attig, chair
Everett Allgood
Ruth E. Christ
Mark Crotteau
Laurel Jizba
Judy Knop
Ann Sitkin
Mitch Turitz