

FRBR Listserv Archive

Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no> le 25/11/2002 11:52:46

Re: FRBR and web documents - "Item" and "Manifestation" concepts

I am working in the "Paradigma" project at the Norwegian National Library - "Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials". (The project web pages, at <http://www.nb.no/paradigma>, are currently available in Norwegian only, but will be translated to English within a few weeks.)

Paradigma will attempt to collect, for long time archival, all publicly available "Norwegian" Internet documents - HTML pages, .pdf/.doc/... files, and also Norwegian NetNews discussion groups. We hope to establish a production line where net documents are "harvested" more or less continuously; a document that is constantly being changed will be archived in several versions. The archive browser tool lets the viewer set a time in the past, and he will then browse the (archived) network as it appeared at the specified time.

Initially, we estimate the number of harvested documents to be in the range of around 10 million. A significant fraction of these are dynamically generated from databases, which should be deposited in the archive as a database, but establishing procedures for this operation will take more time than establishing the automatic harvesting.

Obviously, 10 million documents cannot be handled individually. Assuming that they have been produced over a 3 year period, approx 1000 days, leads to about 10 000 new pages every day, seven days a week. Maybe we could hope for resources to properly catalogue 100 documents, *one percent* of this number, every day...

We need to automate the document handling as far as possible, we need a user interface to the system that allows efficient processing of web documents, and we need proper data models for handling the vast collection of documents. For the latter, FRBR is certainly a viable candidate.

I will present a number of questions/suggestions to this mailing list, regarding how to handle web documents in an FRBR framework. Web documents obviously differ from physical documents in so many aspects that FRBR to a significant degree must be "re-interpreted".

Projects/activities similar to Paradigma have been established in many countries, so I am sure that we are not the only ones meeting the challenges of mating FRBR and the web.

The number of questions / problem areas are so large that I will present my thoughts in separate entries to the mailing list (rather than making one huge entry that noone can spare the time to read...).

For the first round: How do we interpret the "Item" and "Manifestation" concepts with regard to web documents?

Traditional Items of a Manifestation are all (at the outset) more or less identical physical copies; these are which are read by a user. The direct parallel in the web world would be the copy made of the "print master" at the web site, sent across the network to the reader's workstation. But this is a highly transient copy - as soon as the user clicks a link to go on to another page, that copy is gone. Essentially, it is meaningless attaching bibliographic info to something that exists for a minute or two. It seems more natural to treat as an Item the "print master" - the web site files, ignoring the transient copies distributed across the net. But then: The web site files (usually) exist in one single copy only. Is it a unique document, the only Item ever made of the Manifestation?

And: What constitutes the Manifestation?

Of course we could mold web documents into such a model, but is it useful? Could we do it in a different way that is *more* useful?

Documents at a web side *do* come in several copies, though. Every time a web page is updated, a new copy is made. A *non-identical* copy. We already honor differences between Items - they may have different annotations, owners, condition, ... Accepting different *contents* as well certainly is taking a significant sidestep from traditional thinking, but I am currently in favor of this approach.

This also creates a natural candidate for the Manifestation: The abstraction of all the different copies - the different versions - of a web document is the web address, the URL, where these copies are found. The URL does not represent a readable copy, but the object addressed by the URL *at a given time* represents a readable copy.

Obviously, the bibliographical description of a document whose contents change from day to day will be different from that of a book title printed in 20000 copies. There

FRBR Listserv Archive

are some practical problems: You may catalogue a web page, an URL, at the Manifestation level, and the next day, the owner of the page *completely* changes the contents of the page, so the description is highly misleading. (Something similar *could* happen with printed books as well if you mindlessly duplicate bibliographical info for the "2nd ed" without checking the contents, and the author's focus/conclusions/... have changed dramatically since the 1st ed, but this is a rather uncommon situation.) So, there is a need for a way to delimit the time span covered by a Manifestation. I guess there are numerous similar problem situations that must be solved

Note: Referring to different "versions", I am thinking of situations where the new version is intended to *replace* the previous one completely, having roughly the same contents. Web "Continuing Resources", like web newspapers where new information is *added* incrementally, is a different (and complex) discussion.

Do you FRBR people out there accept this approach, or do you condemn it? All sorts of reactions are welcome!

Disclaimer: I Am Not A Librarian. (I'm a computer guy!)

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials"

The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

Email: ketil.albertsen@nb.no

Phone: 75 12 13 35 Fax: 75 12 12 22

Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no> le 25/11/2002 16:57:56

Re: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

I briefly described the Paradigma project in another list entry (look for the subject line 'FRBR and web documents - "Item" and "Manifestation" concepts').

I work under the assumption that a URL is handled as a Manifestation, the object read at a URL at a given time is an Item.

Often, we harvest bitwise identical document copies from different web sites.

It immediately seems a good idea to treat these as the same document - if it has been cataloged at one URL, the same description applies to the other URL.

I guess most cataloging will appear at the Manifestation level. Do two web sites, where one is presumably an exact mirror of the other, represent two different manifestations? Or is the manifestation (in a bibliographical sense) "above" the URLs as a "Manifestation and a half" level? Or should we view the object which exists in two identical objects at different URLs as being an abstraction at a "Item and a half" level? In other words: When I select a catalogued Manifestation, do I select the set of two URLs, do I select one of the URL, completely ignoring the other, or do I select an *abstraction* of the two URLs so that I must move down to a less abstract level to see the two URLs?

A related question:

The objects addressed by the two (or more) URLs may be identical today. Tomorrow, the copy at web site A may have been modified, but not the one at site B. Are they still the same document?

I assume this is a question of abstraction level: At the Item level, the two documents are not the same tomorrow. But at day three, the update at site A has been propagated to site B, and again, the two documents are identical.

Were they the same document at day 1 and 3, but not day 2? Or, were they all the time different documents, so a common bibliographic description is not applicable - even though site B is a mirror of site A? In other words: If I select a manifestation, I select one URL, completely ignoring the other; both URLs must, in principle be catalogued individually even when the documents are bitwise identical.

From a resource point of view, cataloging the same document twice is clearly not desirable. Even from a retrieval point of view, two copies should be identified as identical, so they appear only once in search results (when the document is retrieved from the archives), or one URL can be attempted if the other is unavailable (when the document is read from Internet). So we would very much like to treat the two versions as one document.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Then: The two copies are identical at day 1, but at day 2 they are changed in different directions, day 3 they are even more different, and so it continues: They *never again* become identical, and after a while, they could need completely different descriptions. How should this be handled? Should the document be split into two at, say, day 10? Or should the split be made retroactive, removing any trace of the fact that they were once considered one? Should one of the two resulting documents retain the original, common identity, and in case: Which of the versions should be given this honor?

It is tempting to say "the one that has not been changed or has the least change should retain its identity" - but if that is the mirror of the other, you might end up with the original being "renamed", the outdated copy retains the identity that was supposed to follow the "original". What happens when, finally, the mirror receives the long awaited update and becomes identical to the master again - should it take over the master's new identity as well? Or should the master return to its old identity, even though no change has been made to it, only to the copy?

What if two documents were originally quite different - say, two project proposals. Through a series of negotiations, the two proposals are adjusted to become more identical to each other, and one day they become bitwise identical. Are the two documents one from that day? Is that common document a third one, or one of the two original ones? In the former case, you again have the situation that a change in a *different* document justifies a change in description (the one that was last changed to the common form causes the one that was first changed to become an all new document!).

In the latter case, there is again the question of which identity should be retained.

Do you want more problems?

Assume that two documents are bitwise identical as stored on file. But each copy contains a link to a streaming data resource. This link is relative, not absolute. If the streaming data resource is, say, a sound or video clip, it will probably be identical at both sites. If it is a link to a local web camera, they are conceptually and structurally identical, but the actual images displayed are different ones. Are they identical documents? At the Item level, they clearly are not identical - even at one single site, copies at different times contain different images. But are they identical at the manifestation level? If different institutions use that same web page definition, displaying the web camera image *only*, so that *all* the contents differ from one institution to the other, there may be no visible commonality, the commonality is in the technique (the HTML code) used to produce teh contents. Is *that* a good enough reason to define the pages as identical?

On the other hand: If there is a lot of common intellectual contents on the pages from the various institutions, the web camera image is just a minor detail, are they then just different copies of the same document? How do you set the borderline between "same" and "different" documents?

Preferably, all of these problems should be handled automatically.... (I know very well that today, that is far from realistic).

Any sort of opinions/reactions to these thoughts are welcome!

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials"

The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

Email: ketil.albertsen@nb.no

Phone: 75 12 13 35 Fax: 75 12 12 22

"Dan Matei" <dan@cimec.ro> le 26/11/2002 09:28:53

Re: RE: FRBR and web documents - "Item" and "Manifestation" concepts

Dear Ketil

I will take the "orthodox" view here/now.

So, the problem is:

> For the first round: How do we interpret the "Item" and "Manifestation"

> concepts with regard to web documents?

Good question !

FRBR Listserv Archive

> Traditional Items of a Manifestation are all (at the outset) more or less
> identical physical copies; these are which are read by a user. The direct parallel
in the web world would be
> the copy made of the "print master" at the web site, sent across the network
> to the reader's workstation.
Right: the downloaded copies AND the copy on the server are 'items' (concrete physical
"entities", i.e. files).
> But this is a highly transient copy - as soon as the user
> clicks a link to go on to another page, that copy is gone. Essentially, it is
> meaningless attaching bibliographic info to something that exists for a minute or
two.
I disagree: not always "highly transient". Often I save webpages on my disk, for
future/local use (true: most of the time I do not revisit them; also because I do not
"catalogue" them, so I forget, do not find them etc.) :-)
> It seems more natural to treat as an Item the "print master" - the web site
> files, ignoring the transient copies distributed across the net. But then: The web
> site files (usually) exist in one single copy only. Is it a unique document, the
only Item ever made of the Manifestation?
Even if we ignore the downloaded "copies", you still have "mirror" copies on other
servers and security copies on your tapes/DVDs etc.
> And: What constitutes the Manifestation?
The 'manifestation' is always an abstraction, even if you have a unique 'item'.
Suppose "Mona Lisa" is unique: we still have a 'manifestation' (abstract) and an
'item' (concrete: the actual painting).
> Of course we could mold web documents into such a model, but is it useful?
> Could we do it in a different way that is *more* useful?
Yes, still useful ! At least for consistency.
> Documents at a web side *do* come in several copies, though. Every time a
> web page is updated, a new copy is made. A *non-identical* copy. We already honor
> differences between Items - they may have different annotations, owners, condition,
> ... Accepting different *contents* as well
> certainly is taking a significant sidestep from traditional thinking, but I
> am currently in favor of this approach.
That's another "huge" problem ! Strictly speaking, a "non-identical" copy belongs to
an other manifestation, maybe even to an other expression: the "new edition" syndrom
(hey, you (genuine) cataloguers, out there ! may I use this metaphor ?)
Of course, in practice, we (at least I) cheat a bit: not every comma added makes a new
edition. Still ...
> This also creates a natural candidate for the Manifestation: The abstraction
> of all the different copies - the different versions - of a web document is the web
> address, the URL, where these copies are found. The URL does not represent a
> readable copy, but the object addressed by the URL *at a given time* represents a
> readable copy.
Different copies: yes, different versions: no (not very dogmatic, however ! he, he,
hi, hi !)
> Obviously, the bibliographical description of a document whose contents
> change from day to day will be different from that of a book title printed in 20000
> copies. There are some practical problems: You may catalogue a web page, an URL, at
> the Manifestation level, and the next day, the owner of the page *completely*
> changes the contents of the page, so the description is highly misleading.
> (Something similar *could* happen with printed books as well if you mindlessly
> duplicate bibliographical info for the "2nd ed" without checking the contents, and
> the author's focus/conclusions/... have changed dramatically since the 1st ed, but
> this is a rather uncommon situation.)
> So, there is a need for a way to delimit the time span covered by a Manifestation.
As usual, we will use judgment to "separate" "editions" of web documents. Criterion:
not time, but "significant" change of content, I guess.
> Web "Continuing Resources", like web newspapers where new information is *added*
> incrementally, is a different (and complex) discussion.
Yes: problem for PhD students !
I have to stop now. I will earn a living for a couple of hours, then, maybe, I will
enjoy FRBR again.
Dan

FRBR Listserv Archive

Dan Matei, director
CIMEC - Institutul de Memorie Culturala [Institute for Cultural Memory]
Piata Presei Libere nr. 1, CP 33-90,
713411 Bucuresti [Bucharest], Romania
tel/fax (+40-1) 224 37 42

Maja Žumer <Maja.Zumer@nuk.uni-lj.si> le 26/11/2002 16:11:37

Re: RE: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

Ketil started an interesting discussion. I would like to give some general remarks without going into details (for the time being).

First I have to comment on the implied assumption that FRBR model was developed only (primarily) with printed publications in mind. That is obviously not true; the intention of the study was to provide a model for different kinds and types of publications and we can see it from the examples as well (e.g. performances). Unfortunately no examples for electronic resources are given... Ketil's questions are both theoretical and practical, but maybe we should regard them from a different perspective: it is not so much a question of 'fitting' the real-life situation into the model, but rather how the theoretical model can help us design a better system. The question therefore is not whether 'x' is an item or a manifestation, but what it is we want to achieve for our users. What are THEY searching for? How do THEY want to see mirror sites? What is 'the same content' for the user? And so on... Most of the dilemmas listed were already present in the 'classical' cataloguing.

I am glad some discussion has started.

Maja

PS: Is Dan proposing a PhD dissertation on implementation and use of ISBD(CR)?

Matthew Beacom <matthew.beacom@yale.edu> le 26/11/2002 19:06:42

Re: Re: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

The issue you raise is one that others have encountered. In cataloging online serials, catalogers have been facing a similar problem. The approaches so far have been, roughly, two. One is to use the record for the print manifestation as a de facto work (or expression) record that incorporates information on the e-versions of the title that are available. This sort of works and appears to be cheap (in terms of labor costs) and so is seen as a useful quick and dirty method. The other is to create separate records for each online version of the title. Although the content of the various e-versions is pretty much the same (The extent of online coverage may vary and some particular pieces of the content--ads, perhaps--may not be in all e-versions.), they are being treated as different manifestations and as such are being cataloged separately. This sort of works, too. While it is seen as expensive (in terms of labor costs), it is seen as a clearer (at least to library staff) way to manage the online materials in one's collections. Among the librarians who catalog serials and follow CONSER (see <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/>), there is some discussion and some practice of making one record for all the online versions of the title. So, in short, I think this is an area that could use a solution. No one is really happy with what has been done so far.

All the above is just a kind of general comment. Below I've made a few responses in the context of your message.

Matthew Beacom

Catalog Librarian for Networked Information Resources

Yale University Library

(203) 432-4947

matthew.beacom@yale.edu

<http://www.library.yale.edu/~mbeacom>

FRBR Listserv Archive

Anne Munkebyaune <anne.munkebyaune@bibsys.no> le 27/11/2002 11:31:53

Re: Re: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

Ketil is adressing a lot of features of web-sites. Some of them might easily be compared to similarities with print documents, like Matthew Beacom stated in his answer. Many of the problems are the same as the problems we have already met in serials, only I think that web-sites are "worse". Or are they? To answer these question I think some basic problems need to be discussed. Like the question of what is the extent of a web-site. Ketil has met this problem in his question of the web camera. I think that the images streaming through a web camera cannot be consideres as part of any document. We cannot catalogue images "streaming through" anything, therefore we should not consider them as documents or parts of documents. (It would be like looking out the window and cataloguing what you see. :-))

The question of extent of web-sites is difficult for several reasons. Not all hyperlinks within a web-site is pointing to a part of the same website, but some of them do.

Before we can answer these question, we cannot answer the question of changes, and before we have answered the questions of changes, we cannot answer questions like: when do we have a new expression, manifestation or item.

Another point is that web-sites are not one type of document, they are many. All of them (or almost all) have print or other "itemized" documents. Many of these have never been thought of being published by the producer and have been far away from any library and therefore not at all being catalogued.

The mirror site problem is another one. Your problem seems to be that you have to consider likeness or not-likeness at a *certain moment*. If a site is updated, with the mirror site updated two days later you might have a problem if you store and need to catalogue these as they appear at that moment. Even if the intention of the publisher is to create mirror sites, you are in danger of not representing them as mirror sites in your paradigma project, but in the real world they are (but not during the two days they are different. :-))

Basically I agree with Dan Mattei that mirror sites are items of the same manifestation, but if they don't behave like mirror sites, they are not mirror sites.

Anne Munkebyaune,
BIBSYS
Norway

Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no> le 27/11/2002 12:26:41

Re: RE: FRBR and web documents - "Item" and "Manifestation" concepts

Dan Matei wrote:

> Right: the downloaded copies AND the copy on the server are 'items'
> (concrete physical "entities", i.e. files).

Actually, I have spent quite a few hours explaining to completely "non-computerized" people how I can refer to something that is merely a magnetization pattern as something "physical". The disk (the medium) surely is a (or more exactly: one) physical item, but making people understand that turning the magnetism in the surface in this or the other direction - in particular when I am completely unable to tell them *where* I do it on the disk, I just shrug: "Well, it is scattered all over!" - *that's* difficult!

To non-computer people, the "physical" aspects of a file is some imaginary thing that exists in my head alone... :-)

But I'll leave that question for now - I, too, usually describe digital files as "physical".

> > But this is a highly transient copy [...]

> I disagree: not always "highly transient". Often I save webpages on my
> disk, for future/local use (true: most of the time I do not revisit
> them; also because I do not "catalogue" them, so I forget, do not find
> them etc.) :-)

FRBR Listserv Archive

(I assume you know the first law of Xerox: If you don't have the time to read it, copy it! :-)

Physically, there are several copies of a web page you view: In proxies between the web server and your workstation, in your workstation's own web cache, while you read the document it may be in your workstation's swap file, it is certainly in your computer's memory (RAM) etc.etc.

Your explicit copies to disk are like Xerox copies made of a book or magazine. I actually do "catalogue" some of my (physical) Xerox copies: In some of my ring binders have a "table of contents" of those papers I have copied.

But would you treat these copies as "significant" from a *conceptual*, or modelling point of view? I suggest that we do not.

> Even if we ignore the downloaded "copies", you still have "mirror"

> copies on other servers and security copies on your tapes/DVDs etc.

I have raised the question of multiple web servers hosting the same document in another list entry; it raises so many problems that it needs a separate thread. In any case: These are separately addressed, separately maintained entities, so they come in quite a different situation, compared to cache copies or security copies, which are identified as the "original" document from which they were made, and are supposed to be bitwise identical. Once you "detach" such a copy, e.g. changing the name by which it is identified from a URL to a file name in your private folder, then it conceptually is like a Xerox.

> > And: What constitutes the Manifestation?

> The 'manifestation' is always an abstraction, even if you have a unique

> 'item'. Suppose "Mona Lisa" is unique: we still have a 'manifestation'

> (abstract) and an 'item' (concrete: the actual painting).

I beg to disagree! One example: You can consult the Norwegian Bureau of Statistics to obtain a document (a report) on how many people in this country are named "Ketil Albertsen". (In case you are curious: 2653 people have "Ketil" as their first name, 762 have "Albertsen" as their last name).

This report is the only "document" there exists - the only readable, printable, viewable entity. But it is never stored in a file (except in conceptually insignificant cache copies).

The abstraction of all such documents, the "generic" report for any person name in Norway: That is the database (including its presentation software) at the Bureau. So the "abstraction" is physical: It exists in files, while the document does not.

I suggest that the database is treated as a Manifestation; the reports as Items. So we have a concrete, physical Manifestation, non-physical items.

Alternative 1: Each report is a non-physical Item, but has "its own" Manifestation made up of the composition of database entries used to create exactly this report and no others. That certainly makes the Manifestation abstract (if that is a goal in itself). You could of course create a physical item by printing out the report, as long as the document in question is like a sheet of paper. When background sounds, video clips etc. comes into the documents, we may feel that model becomes somewhat strained...

Alternative 2: We consider the entire database one Item. Justification? "It is physical; something physical is an Item, and an Item is physical" Even if the database contains text only, we have a text Item that *cannot be printed out* - that is: Not as one document, as one unit. The only way to relate to this text item as a reader is to access it as zillions of highly overlapping fragments.

The argument doesn't break any law of logic, but is it *useful*? Or, is it *the most useful* alternative?

If we are to be consistent, I assume that we then should treat *all* databases as a single Item. Shall any document entered into a database lose its identity, its properties as an individual document - is a database the black hole idea of document modelling? :-)

I hope not.

> Of course we could mold web documents into such a model, but is it

> useful? Could we do it in a different way that is *more* useful?

Yes, still useful ! At least for consistency.

> > [...]

> That's another "huge" problem ! Strictly speaking, a "non-identical"

> copy belongs to an other manifestation, maybe even to an other

> expression: the "new edition" syndrom (hey, you (genuine) cataloguers,

FRBR Listserv Archive

> out there ! may I use this metaphor ?)

I am fully aware that this is the approach for static documents, whether printed, recorded on film, CD or whatever. Do we *want* this approach for dynamic documents, whether created on the fly from a database by automated software, created in the reader's workstation based on received HTML code, the viewer's environment, time of day or whatever, or the HTML file edited twice a day by the author himself?

Maybe I'm being (too?) pragmatic... I have no problems accepting your argument from a "purist" point of view, I just don't see how it could be useful for purposes of bibliographical description and retrieval. If we "waste" both the Item, Manifestation and possibly Expression description levels on comparatively small (but above typographical corrections!) changes, we may be throwing the baby out with the water.

> As usual, we will use judgment to "separate" "editions" of web documents. Criterion: not time, but "significant" change of content, I > guess.

Resources will never permit manual judgement of each and every version of all web pages; we need some automated facilities. In our project, I have suggested that the cataloguer (I am assuming that the document has come through the needle's eye to be catalogued at all!) must estimate the expected change rate, choosing among (1) *Never* re-evaluate this document again, (2) Present *any* new edition for re-evaluation, (3) After a specified time (months, typically), present later editions for re-evaluation, or (4) Present for re-evaluation once the difference from the current version exceeds a specified limit.

For alternative 4, we can currently handle text only, and the amount of change is measured by the number of differing text lines. (We use a "diff" style program for this.)

Obviously, the cataloguer will set defaults for these values, so as long as roughly similar documents are being handled, the values need not be edited. (We make an attempt at automated grouping of web documents, so the cataloguer will, hopefully, handle similar documents in one session.)

Certainly, these are pragmatic techniques, but I hope to be able to mate them with sound academic concepts too :-)

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials"

The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

Email: ketil.albertsen@nb.no

Phone: 75 12 13 35 Fax: 75 12 12 22

Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no> le 27/11/2002 12:55:37

Re: RE: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

Maja wrote:

> First I have to comment on the implied assumption that FRBR model > was developed only (primarily) with printed publications in mind. > That is obviously not true; the intention of the study was to > provide a model for different kinds and types of publications and > we can see it from the examples as well (e.g. performances).

I certainly did not intend to make an assumption about FRBR applying to printed documents only. I have certainly noticed that there are examples of both non-physical and transient (or both!) objects.

However, as can also be seen from those examples, the mapping from "the real world" onto the model is not always obvious for these classes of objects. Yet, they are in some aspects "simple" to model compared to, say, a web page: Even a performance is a closed entity, it is delimited in time, in participants etc. A web page is not - you have no idea when the "final" version is made (the last one before the page is deleted). You do not know who will be responsible for the next version or where the next version will appear. You do not know whether a linked object is conceptually part of the same document or not. Parts of this composite object may be common to other documents (which you may or may not be aware of). The contents may differ

FRBR Listserv Archive

significantly, depending on when you retrieve it, from where you retrieve it, which tool (web reader) you use to retrieve it, parameters in your viewing environment, which documents you have previously viewed,... You may interact with the document, display supporting pages, replace contents piecewise. Updates to the document are made piecewise, too. You might consider a page displaying an image from a web camera as being *constantly* updated.

And so on. While FRBR already is suitable for handling *some* non- printed classes of objects, it seems to me that more work is required to define how to handle network objects such as web pages.

> Unfortunately no examples for electronic resources are given...

I could make guesses about the reasons for that... :-)

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials"

The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

Email: ketil.albertsen@nb.no

Phone: 75 12 13 35 Fax: 75 12 12 22

Knut Hegna <knut.hegna@ub.uio.no> le 27/11/2002 14:17:59

Re: RE: FRBR and web documents - "Item" and "Manifestation" concepts

I tried to investigate problem this through a practical example 2 years ago. I hoped to get some cataloguers interested, but failed, mainly because the experiment includes some technical fixes, I think. Here is my experiment:

<http://folk.uio.no/knuthe/frbr/work.html>

Knut

Knut Hegna

Me : <http://folk.uio.no/knuthe/>

My library : <http://www.ub.uio.no/umn/inf/>

Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no> le 27/11/2002 14:48:14

Re: Re: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

> In cataloging online serials, catalogers have been facing a similar problem.
> The approaches so far have been, roughly, two. One is to use the record for
> the print manifestation as a de facto work (or expression) record that
> incorporates information on the e-versions of the title that are available.
> [...] The other is to create
> separate records for each online version of the title. Although the content
> of the various e-versions is pretty much the same (The extent of online
> coverage may vary and some particular pieces of the content--ads,
> perhaps--may not be in all e-versions.), they are being treated as
> different manifestations and as such are being cataloged separately.

My guess is that the similarity between printed and online newspapers and journals will soon fade away. At least Norwegian newspapers are already today quite distinct from their paper counterparts - the headlines are (roughly) the same, but the coverage is quite different, with very few in-depth articles (essentially, the front page presents a headline and the first line of the ingres, the "read the entire story" page repeats the headline and the ingres plus another sentence or two, then the text body repeats the headline and the ingres, although usually in different words... :-))

The way people relate to the web newspaper as a medium is also quite different: The reader usually makes a quite narrow selection of material (often from a list of "News last 12 hours" or "The most read articles", with only a few keywords given in the list). Each article has a "Mail this article to a friend" (a facility that is certainly being used!).

FRBR Listserv Archive

You can enter into online discussions based on each article. There are direct links to other sources, typically foreign web newspapers or journals. You may do full text searches in the newspaper's historical archive. Often, there is a list of "Old articles on this subject" with each article prepared for you as well.

Altogether: Web newspapers is a completely different medium from paper newspapers. In the future, they will divert even further. Other classes of periodicals may still be close to their paper siblings, but you can see the same trends even in classical, "heavy" scientific journals.

So the "cheap" processing is likely to serve only as a way to delay what will come, whether we like it (from a resource point of view) or not...

> For online resources the manifestation may be a set of one item. Mirror
> sites would be an instance of the manifestation being a set of a small
> number of items. Putting aside the temporary copies made in by the viewing
> client when viewing an item at its URL, copying and redistributing
> identical or not so identical copies of the item viewed would create more
> items that belong to the same set of items that make up the manifestation.

From a modelling/cataloguing point of view: Do the items have any value? Would you ever create an item specific bibliographical description? If not: Couldn't you simply throw away the Item level in your model of online resources, describing the Manifestation only?

> > Often, we harvest bitwise identical document copies from different web
> > sites. It immediately seems a good idea to treat these as the same
> > document - if it has been cataloged at one URL, the same description
> > applies to the other URL.

> I'm not quite sure what you mean here. A bitwise identical document copies
> from a different web site would be the same expression, could be the same
> manifestation, but would at the least be a different item. Much of the same
> description would apply for sure, but not necessarily all of it.

I deliberately used the term "document", rather than those FRBR specific terms, because I am not quite sure where to put it in the model.

Certainly, in traditional thinking it is obvious that the two web sites keep different copies. It *could* be the best approach, maintaining this for web pages as well. But we need other grouping/abstraction mechanisms as well - e.g. "the set of versions that exists of the web page". We can push this grouping up to a higher level, leaving fewer mechanisms available for other kinds of grouping, or we could deem the distinction between identical web copies unworthy of a level of its own.

After all, there is no law of nature demanding that there must be exactly four abstraction levels in a document model. Even for printed documents, we could argue for fewer or more levels, and the exact borderline between different Expressions and different Manifestations is not always very distinct; there is a certain degree of arbitrariness in the FRBR choices.

> You have noted that the URL would be different, but it could also have very
> different access restrictions on it than its identical twin. The
> description might also include information on the corporate bodies
> responsible for making this particular item available, or available in
> digital form, or available under the particular access restrictions.

These are valid arguments in the discussion of whether to treat identical copies as distinct items. Yet: How common is the situation you describe?

I should mention that the archive we are building is based on the legal deposit laws, so I maybe somewhat biased wrt. access restrictions: If the document is not publicly available, then it is not subject to legal deposit. So, different access restrictions are of less importance to us. In most cases, information about the body making the item available is implied by the URL; this information will rarely be specific to each and every document or document component at a given web site.

This is not to say that variations in access control, responsible publisher, and other item specific parameters not mentioned here, are absent - I only question whether they are sufficiently significant to deserve an abstraction level of their own.

> I think the idea of "half" levels is very confusing. Most cataloging that I
> am familiar with mixes all 4 levels in one record or in one bibliographic
> record and associated holdings records.

I dislike the "half" levels myself; if it was integrated into the model, it would really change it from a four-level to a five-level model. Yet it can be helpful as an analysis tool: We can certainly describe more than four levels of grouping into

FRBR Listserv Archive

abstractions. So we draw them up, and try out alternatives: Should it be considered the lower sublayer of Expression or the top sublayer of Manifestation? (Or similarly for Manifestation/Item) We make a decision, and then the main layer being assigned the sublayer in question must be designed/implemented in a way that can handle those groupings that are not considered significant enough to justify its own abstraction level.

The practical consequences could appear e.g. in an FRBR inspired web browser (assuming that a cataloguer has added necessary information to identify the FRBR abstractions of the web objects in question; this rarely can be done automatically): When will the user have to choose among alternative URLs? He identifies a Work - is the next step to choose an URL to select an Expression? Or will he select an Expression first, and then choose among URLs to select a Manifestation? Or will he choose a manifestation - say, the PDF format one, and then select one of the URLs identifying Items that are copies of the PDF file? Or will he select the manifest document independent of bitwise representations as PDF or DOC file (which may be letter by letter identical, including pagination etc., once printed out), and choose an URL as the last step?

If each URL represents an Expression (as has been suggested as a possible alternative in some cases), selecting an Expression is the last thing the user would do - you (normally) don't have any choices once the URL is selected.

The user wouldn't be "bothered" with the Manifestation and Item levels - is that desirable? If each URL makes a Manifestations, the user doesn't relate to Items. Is that what we want?

This exercise should be repeated, considering not a static document with definite content, but with dynamic documents being frequently updated, in particular when these updates are propagated (with varying delays) to mirror sites: At which stage in the selection/navigation process should the user be directed to one web server, to one URL?

In our archive access tool, once the user reaches the "URL level", he is presented with the entire set of chronological versions of that URL, with clickable marks on a time line. At what abstraction level does he make his selection? We have exactly the same set of web page versions retrieved from a mirror site; the time line marks appear somewhat later, but that's all the difference there is, except that this timeline is associated with another URL. Is it "wrong" (by FRBR philosophy) to display the two time lines as representing the same set of versions, of the same document, saying that this is a single dynamic document, treated as one unit, as one manifestation?

(In any case, we will save bitwise identical pages in one copy only - our archive is read-only, so we will have no problem of conflicting updates.)

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials"

The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

Email: ketil.albertsen@nb.no

Phone: 75 12 13 35 Fax: 75 12 12 22

Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no> le 27/11/2002 15:10:59

Re: Re: FRBR and web documents - How to handle identical copies at different web sites?

Anne Munkebyaune, BIBSYS, wrote:

> Your problem seems to be that
> you have to consider likeness or not-likeness at a *certain moment*. If
> a site is updated, with the mirror site updated two days later you might
> have a problem if you store and need to catalogue these as they appear
> at that moment. Even if the intention of the publisher is to create
> mirror sites, you are in danger of not representing them as mirror sites
> in your paradigma project, but in the real world they are (but not
> during the two days they are different. :-))

The solution I currently propose is to treat the sequence of versions of a web document as one dynamic document. So, the version sequence from the master site should match the version sequence from the mirror, but not necessarily with the same time

FRBR Listserv Archive

stamps. There may even be versions missing from either sequence, because we do not continuously monitor changes and may therefore miss editions when they appear with short intervals.

> Basically I agree with Dan Mattei that mirror sites are items of the
> same manifestation, but if they don't behave like mirror sites, they are
> not mirror sites.

The problem is somewhat reduced when you consider a document in isolation, not an entire web site. But there certainly could be a problem if we erroneously assume that one version sequence is a mirror of another when this is in fact not the case. As one colleague of mine suggested: Many ISPs provide new customers with a standard template for creating a personal home page. If we happen to collect such templates before the customer personalizes it, we might have version threads going in completely different directions, that will never merge into one.

So, in our software, we must certainly include an "alert" function that detects when the number of versions with no match on another timeline exceeds a certain threshold. When this happen, "breaking off" the version sequence to make it an independent object must be a very simple operation.

We do not yet have any indications on how frequent such cases will be; we are just about to start the first large-scale harvesting round of the Norwegian Internet. A single harvesting round obviously cannot tell us about version sequences, but it can give us information about how frequently identical documents appear (at that point in time, of course).

Jennifer Bowen, 27/11/2002, 17:42

Re: Introduction, and FRBR user studies

Colleagues:

Many thanks to Patrick Le Boeuf for facilitating the creation of this listserv.

First, I'd like to introduce myself: my name is Jennifer Bowen, and I am Chair of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules' Format Variation Working Group. All of the members of this group, which includes members from the U.S., Canada, Australia, and the UK, are now subscribed to the FRBR listserv. Two of our reports are listed on the wonderful IFLA FRBR Bibliography. Our most recent work is also now available via links on the JSC Website: this includes our latest report and minutes of a meeting of the U.S. and U.K. representatives in London last September. <http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/current.html>. I would very much appreciate hearing your comments on our work.

Today, I would like to ask if anyone has conducted (or knows about) any user studies or usability testing related to systems that incorporate FRBR. I was recently asked by the President of Endeavor Information Systems (Voyager) whether "...there is any evidence that users really want this" (i.e. a system that can organize search results by work, expression, etc.). Could anyone point me toward any work that has been done in this area?

Thank you.

Jennifer Bowen

Head of Cataloging, University of Rochester Libraries

Head of Technical Services, Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music

jbowen@library.rochester.edu

(585) 274-1370

Rush Rhees Library, Box 270055

University of Rochester,

Rochester, NY 14627-0055

or

Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music

27 Gibbs St., Rochester, NY 14604

Jennifer Bowen, 09/12/2002, 16:47

Re: Call for System Liaisons

FRBR Listserv Archive

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules' Format Variation Working Group is seeking to establish liaisons with system vendors and utilities that are either engaged with or are considering incorporating the data model from the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) into the design of their products.

The Format Variation Working Group is now beginning to develop criteria for evaluating online systems that organize bibliographic data according to the FRBR model. We are especially interested in issues related to creating systems that users will find intelligible and easy to use, rather than simply implementing the FRBR theoretical model for the sake of doing so. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue with those who are in the process of developing these systems.

The JSC Format Variation Working Group was charged in 2001 with investigating the feasibility of incorporating the FRBR entity "expression" into AACR utilizing a proof of concept model. In June 2002 our discussion paper, "Dealing With FRBR Expressions in MARC 21" (MARBI DP-08) was discussed by MARBI at the ALA Annual Meeting. This paper, along with the other reports from the Group to date, are posted on the website of the Joint Steering Committee at <http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/current.html>.

System vendors who would like to establish a formal liaison relationship with the JSC's Format Variation Working Group may contact the group's Chair, Jennifer Bowen, at jbowen@library.rochester.edu or (585) 274-1370.

Jennifer Bowen

Head of Cataloging, University of Rochester Libraries

Head of Technical Services, Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music

jbowen@library.rochester.edu

(585) 274-1370

Rush Rhees Library, Box 270055

University of Rochester,

Rochester, NY 14627-0055

or

Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music

27 Gibbs St., Rochester, NY 14604

Patrick Le Bœuf, 31/12/2002, 09:40

Re: A website devoted to FRBR

Dear all,

Last summer in Glasgow it was decided that the Working Group on FRBR would develop its own web site, that would be hosted by IFLANET.

I took advantage of those Yuletide quiet days to scratch a first draft of what our web site might look like. I submit this first draft to you before I send it to Kerstin Dahl for integration to IFLANET. I prepared a Word version and an HTML version based on the pattern of IFLANET pages; I do not know what will be technically more convenient for Kerstin Dahl, my intention was to occasion as little work to her as possible.

Please have a look at this first draft and do not hesitate to suggest any kind of changes and enhancements. The web site will be the working group's collective property and everyone of us has a part in designing it. Of course, I beg native English-speakers to correct my poor, awkward and unidiomatic English.

I left on the "homepage" Barbara's "Terms of reference" for the IFLA Group, with some changes, as the Working Group actually has been created and the original text was conjugated in the future tense (Barbara, can you tell me whether you approve those changes?).

I wrote a number of "FAQ", please do not hesitate to suggest modifications to the ones I wrote and to suggest other topics that could be dealt with in FAQ.

The bibliography has been updated (it is now version 4.0); it includes new items by our colleagues Maja Zumer and Mauro Guerrini. I also added references to the "Variations2" model developed in Bloomington, Indiana, for music, that is very close to FRBR except for terminology (Work = Work, Expression = Instantiation, Manifestation = Container, Item = Media Object). I did not include however any reference to the Medlane Project's XOBIS (XML Organic Bibliographic Information Schema) because it is not directly related to FRBR, but I think this is an extremely interesting new

FRBR Listserv Archive

approach and we should consider it and strive for interoperability between FRBR and XOBIS.

Here is the Word document:

(See attached file: WGFRBR_Website.doc)

And here are the HTML files:

(See attached file: WGFRBR_Teaching.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_Bibliography.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_FAQ.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_FinalReport.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_ImplementationReports.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_listserv.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_MeetingReports.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_Papers.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR.htm)(See attached file: FRBRWG_20020819-20_Report.rtf)(See attached file: FRBR_bibliography.rtf)(See attached file: spacer.gif)(See attached file: contacts.gif)(See attached file: ifla1.gif)(See attached file: search.gif)(See attached file: 2levas.gif)

Dan Matei, 06/01/2003, 15:26

Re: FRBR for us or for our children ? An open letter to Olivia M.A. Madison and John D. Byrum

Dear FRBR fans

I attach a letter to two of the FRBR parents, in order to initiate a quick discussion. Please accept apologies for lack of diplomacy.

Happy New Year !

Dan Matei

Dan Matei, director

CIMEC - Institutul de Memorie Culturala [Institute for Cultural Memory] Piata Presei Libere nr. 1, CP 33-90, 713411 Bucuresti [Bucharest], Romania

tel/fax (+40-21) 224 37 42

www.cimec.ro

Barbara Tillett, 06/01/2003, 20:18

Re: Re: FRBR for us or for our children ? An open letter to Olivia M.A. Madison and John D. Byrum

Dan - You may be interested to know of the FRBR issues and points that we identified at the Glasgow meeting as recorded in the minutes from that Working Group - Patrick LeBoeuf (chair) is working on getting our Web site up and running, just as he has successfully done with this listserv to get conversation started. So, you will soon be able to see what other progress we have made in directions you find of concern. As you undoubtedly know, IFLA is an organization of dedicated volunteers and we are opening up this discussion for the very reasons you cite - FRBR is extremely important.

I was one of the consultants along with Tom Delsey and Elaine Svenonius and later Beth Dulabahn who developed the model that was reviewed by the IFLA Study Group (chaired by Olivia Madison for the most part of its existence). The Study Group did the work on the national level elements, and I agree those decisions deserve wider discussion and reconsideration. We hope this new IFLA Working Group on FRBR can make some headway in that direction as they work with the ISBD Review Group (now chaired by John Byrum). Each of these groups are part of the Cataloguing Section, and I am very committed to seeing them succeed.

On a related matter and addressing one of your urgent items, perhaps you can help me make the right contacts in Romania? I wrote to the director of the national library with no reply in October, but I would like to find out if they would sponsor an official representative to the upcoming IFLA Meeting of Cataloguing Experts on an International Cataloguing Code that has been in the planning for several years now and is scheduled (first in a series of regional meetings on this) for July 2003. We are looking for those people in each country who are responsible for national decisions regarding cataloging rules and rule revisions. This is an invitational meeting of experts, intended to be about 50-60 participants who will attempt to reach agreement towards a future international cataloging code, just as you propose. Many of us agree

FRBR Listserv Archive

with your thinking on this point and are trying to make it a reality. I look forward to hearing from you directly on this matter about the appropriate contact in your country. Thanks very much -
Barbara Tillett, Chair, IFLA Cataloguing Section

Patrick Le Bœuf, 15/01/2003, 14:28

Re: FRBR WG web site

Dear all,

Here is an updated version of the draft webpages for the Working Group on FRBR's web site, with amendments from Barbara Tillett, John Byrum, and David Miller, whom I warmly thank. Do you agree for having this first version on the Web? Kerstin, do you think it will be possible to add these pages to IFLANET? And as to future revisions, what would the most convenient way be for you? Do you prefer that I maintain updates on my own computer and send you the corrected files, or that I just send you as Word files those paragraphs that should replace the previous ones? Please tell me what would be easier for you.

Best wishes,

Patrick

(See attached file: WGFRBR_Website.doc)(See attached file: FRBRWG_20020819-20_Report.rtf)(See attached file: WGFRBR.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_Bibliography.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_FAQ.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_FinalReport.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_ImplementationReports.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_listserv.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_MeetingReports.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_Papers.htm)(See attached file: WGFRBR_Teaching.htm)(See attached file: FRBR_bibliography.rtf)

Gunilla Jonsson, 15/01/2003, 15:05

Re: Re: FRBR WG web site

I think it looks magnificent, and impressive, indeed. Cannot think of anything to change. I think it's best now to get it on the IFLANET, and if changes are required, it will emerge through use.

Congratulations!

Gunilla Jonsson

Glenn Patton, 15/01/2003, 20:13

Re: RE: FRBR WG web site

Yes, Patrick, I would agree this is ready to be made public. As Gunilla said, the need for further additions and/or "tweaking" will become evident as people use the site.

--Glenn

Gerhard Riesthuis, 16/01/2003, 11:07

Re: Re: FRBR WG web site

Dear Patrick,

It looks great to me. It should go to the IFLANET as soon as possible I think.

Regards,

Gerhard

Susanna Peruginelli, 16/01/2003, 14:03

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: R: FRBR WG web site

Dear Patrick, I think you have done a very good work and I hope the site will be available soon for everybody: it will be a very useful tool for information and a reliable reference point for everyone planning to work on it. Thank you. Susanna Peruginelli

Cristina Magliano, 16/01/2003, 15:47

Re: Re: FRBR WG web site

Dear Patrick, is a wonderful work! It will be very useful for everybody involved in the study of FRBR. As you know the Italian Committee for the revision of Italian cataloging rules is working very deeply on FRBR application and I think that all the informations of FRBR working Group of IFLA can contribute to share opinions and news and so on. Best regards, Cristina

Dr. Cristina Magliano
Head of Dept. of Methodology of Cataloguig and Training
Central Institute for the Union Catalogue of Italian Libraries and for
Bibliographic Information
Viale Castro Pretorio, 105
00185 Rome (Italy)
Ph: 0039 06 4989482
Fax: 0039 06 4959302

John Byrum, 16/01/2003, 15:47

Re: RE: FRBR WG web site

Patrick:

If we toast you with a glass a champaign over the Internet, I'd be among those to offer a congratulation to you for your successful design and urge you on to implement it quickly.

John

Dan Matei, 16/01/2003, 16:25

Re: RE: FRBR WG web site

I was without without connection for a week (they blame the weather !), so I had a pleasant surprise with the (off-line) Patrick's manifestations. I suggest a (real) party for the on-line manifestation.

Merci Patrick.

Dan

Marie-Louise Ayres, 20/01/2003, 03:48

Re: FRBR Website

Dear Patrick

From Canberra, the beleagured Australian national capital (five members of the National Library staff lost their homes in the terrible bushfires on Saturday and the emergency is by no means over), I agree with those who say thank you for your work on this, that the site is definitely ready to be implemented, and that many of us will visit it frequently.

Regards

Marie-Louise

Dr Marie-Louise Ayres

Project Manager, Music Australia

FRBR Listserv Archive

National Library of Australia
Parkes ACT 2600
Email: mayres@nla.gov.au
Phone: +61 2 6262 1536
Fax: +61 2 6273 5081
<http://www.musicaustralia.org>

Marie-Louise Ayres, 23/01/2003, 00:34

Re: FRBR and songs

Dear all

Here at the National Library, we are thinking about FRBR and music issues in regards to our service under development, MusicAustralia. The service will gather metadata about digital and non-digital music objects, in score, digital score and audio formats, from a range of library, archive and commercial providers. Whether we will be able to develop a system which can co-locate originating, manifestation level records to expression and work entities remains to be seen, but we'd like to do as good a job as possible on modelling our problems.

I am attaching a project paper on this issue, but our questions can be summarised:

* What is the Work, especially for vocal music? Patrick Le Bœuf characterises this as the problem:

- o Primo la musica?
- o Primo le parole?
- o Primo la musica e le parole?

In the context of Waltzing Matilda, this could be expressed as a choice between modelling either:

- o Music W1 Waltzing Matilda [Composer: Christina MacPherson]
- o Music W2 Waltzing Matilda [Composer: Marie Cowan]
- o Lyric W1 Waltzing Matilda [Lyricist: A.B. Paterson]

Dave de Hugar performance is an Expression of Music W1 and of Lyric W1

Peter Dawson performance is an Expression of Music W2 and of Lyric W1

George Trevare's Jazz Group's performance is an Expression of of Music W2

Or:

- o W1 Waltzing Matilda [Composer: Christina MacPherson; lyricist A.B. Paterson]

- o W2 Waltzing Matilda [Composer: Marie Cowan; lyricist A.B. Paterson]

- o W3 Waltzing Matilda [Composer: Marie Cowan; no lyrics]

Dave de Hugar performance is an Expression of W1

Peter Dawson performance is an Expression of W2

George Trevare's Jazz Group's performance is an Expression of W3

In discussions just yesterday, we decided that another possibility is:

- o W1 Waltzing Matilda Music [Composer: Christina MacPherson]

- o W2 Waltzing Matilda Music [Composer: Marie Cowan]

- o W3 Waltzing Matilda lyric [Lyricist: A.B. Paterson]

- o W4 Waltzing Matilda music and lyric [Composer: Christina MacPherson; lyricist A.B. Paterson]

- o W5 Waltzing Matilda music and lyric [Composer: Marie Cowan; lyricist A.B. Paterson]

What do FRBR colleagues think?

Cheers

Marie-Louise

<<TCP3.2MusicAustralia_LessonsLearnedReportItemRelationships.doc>>

Dr Marie-Louise Ayres

Project Manager, Music Australia

National Library of Australia

Parkes ACT 2600

Email: mayres@nla.gov.au

Phone: +61 2 6262 1536

Fax: +61 2 6273 5081

<http://www.musicaustralia.org>

FRBR Listserv Archive

Dan Matei, 23/01/2003, 10:16

Re: RE: FRBR and songs

I'm glad Marie-Louise started here a triggering discussion about the "FRBR cataloguing guidelines". Their case could make us formulate some "principles" (if we are lucky). Can we agree that we are talking about cultural conventions ? Or there is also some objective "work substance" to be detected in an artifact ?

First:

> In discussions just yesterday, we decided that another possibility is:
> o W1 Waltzing Matilda Music[Composer:
> Christina MacPherson]
> o W2 Waltzing Matilda Music [Composer: Marie
> Cowan]
> o W3 Waltzing Matilda lyric [Lyricist: A.B.
> Paterson]
> o W4 Waltzing Matilda music and lyric
> [Composer: Christina MacPherson; lyricist A.B. Paterson]
> o W5 Waltzing Matilda music and lyric
> [Composer: Marie Cowan; lyricist A.B. Paterson]

I think this "analytic" perception is right (it is also "true" ?). Because:

- a) the two melodies are autonomous works, right ?
- b) the lyrics, i.e. a "poem" is an autonomous work, right ?
- c) the two aggregations are different works: the music and the lyrics are intimately merged, even fused.

Secondly, analogies:

a) deconstructing works

Mona Lisa with the color removed is not a different work: the colors on Mona Lisa can hardly have an existence of their own. [It can be objected that you can't separate the colors from the painting without working on a particular expression, i.e. a reproduction. True. But for a born digital graphical work, you can (?).]

b) constructing works

The Reichstag is a work. Christo's wrapping of it with silvery fabric is another work. The silvery fabric, by itself is not a work. In theory, the very same material could be wrapped on Tour Eiffel, resulting in another work.

Can we infer that:

1. If something has a distinct, autonomous intellectual/artistic existence is a work.
2. The fusion of several distinct works is a different work.

???

Dan

Dan Matei, director

CIMEC - Institutul de Memorie Culturala [Institute for Cultural Memory]

Piata Presei Libere nr. 1, CP 33-90,
713411 Bucuresti [Bucharest], Romania

tel/fax (+40-21) 224 37 42

www.cimec.ro

Barbara Tillett, 23/01/2003, 13:47

Re: RE: FRBR and songs

The FRBR model was intentionally kept simple - only 4 layers to the Group 1 hierarchical entities, plus collections/aggregations and components. I like to think of the "family of works" that are related by sharing some of the same basic "content" (intellectual and/or artistic - in equivalent or derivative relationships) - and of course you can have a work about a work (descriptive relationship). Then there are the more complex combinations or aggregations of works that are also themselves works (the combined lyrics and music) and in the sound recordings and motion picture worlds, that can easily be quite a lot of aggregated works. And here you get into the

FRBR Listserv Archive

whole/part relationships and part to part relationships of the components. We have decided in past rules how many or how few of the relationships to "care about" for bibliographic records, sticking to those we felt were the most important to users. For displays, the collocation of this family of works would presumably help some users. When there is such a family (a very small percentage of all) we also could group the expressions of each of the works and, as needed, further group the various manifestations for each of the unique expressions. We attempted to do that in past rules with the "main entry" (for what we considered the "same" work) and using uniform titles as part of that main entry to collocate records in a catalog for the expressions and manifestations of the same work. For related members of that family of works, we included added entries in their bibliographic records using the standardized uniform title to collocate those related records with the records for manifestations of the main work.

We have a Format Variations Working Group (of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR) looking at some possible new devices for grouping or collocating the bibliographic records, such as work-level citations (a variation of the old "uniform titles") and expression-level citations that presumably would build on the work-level citation by adding elements that identify the particular expression. There may be other devices we can imagine to accomplish the identification and collocation goals. -
bt

Dr. Barbara B. Tillett, Ph.D.
Chief, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
Library of Congress
101 Independence Ave., S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20540-4305
U.S.A.
tel.: +1 (202) 707-4714
fax: +1 (202) 707-6629
email: btil@loc.gov

Gunilla Jonsson, 23/01/2003, 13:55

Re: Re: FRBR and songs

I'm not going to go deeply into the discussion -- haven't time for that.
Some question marks, only. See below!
Gunilla

Dan Matei wrote:

>I'm glad Marie-Louise started here a triggering discussion about the
>"FRBR cataloguing guidelines". Their case could make us formulate some
>"principles" (if we are lucky).
>Can we agree that we are talking about cultural conventions ? Or there
>is also some objective "work substance" to be detected in an artifact ?
I would like to say, yes, cultural conventions, and they may change, as we all know.
What implications might that have?
>First:
>>In discussions just yesterday, we decided that another possibility is:
>> o W1 Waltzing Matilda Music [Composer: Christina MacPherson]
>> o W2 Waltzing Matilda Music [Composer: Marie Cowan]
>> o W3 Waltzing Matilda lyric [Lyricist: A.B. Paterson]
>> o W4 Waltzing Matilda music and lyric [Composer: Christina
MacPherson; lyricist A.B. Paterson]
>> o W5 Waltzing Matilda music and lyric [Composer: Marie Cowan;
lyricist A.B. Paterson]
>>
>I think this "analytic" perception is right (it is also "true" ?).
>Because:
>a) the two melodies are autonomous works, right ?
>b) the lyrics, i.e. a "poem" is an autonomous work, right ?
>c) the two aggregations are different works: the music and the lyrics
>are intimately merged, even fused.

FRBR Listserv Archive

I'm not sure about your "fusion", Dan, or Marie-Louise's W4, W5. Sure, it is thinkable that you have a fusion, or a merge, of two works, but I would like to think, that for a new work to result, it should not be possible to deconstruct this "compound" without destroying it. (Cfr your own argument about deconstruction below.) That is, it would be impossible to take part of a complete manifestation of an expression of that work, because something is lacking. What would be the consequence for e.g. theater performances, otherwise? I'm sure many directors would like to think of their own productions as works in their own right, but I would prefer to consider them as single manifestations of expressions of works. The purpose for us should be, I think, to create a framework within which we can link things in an intelligible hierarchy. If we allow for a new "work" everytime two works are combined, we will get an awful lot of works!

I'm certainly not dead sure about this, it's just my gut reaction.

>Secondly, analogies:

>a) deconstructing works

>Mona Lisa with the color removed is not a different work: the colors on
>Mona Lisa can hardly have an existence of their own. [It can be objected
>that you can't separate the colors from the painting without working on
>a particular expression, i.e. a reproduction. True. But for a born
>digital graphical work, you can (?).]

This deconstruction test is a good idea.

>b) constructing works

>The Reichstag is a work. Christo's wrapping of it with silvery fabric is
>another work. The silvery fabric, by itself is not a work. In theory,
>the very same material could be wrapped on Tour Eiffel, resulting in
>another work.

>Can we infer that:

>1. If something has a distinct, autonomous intellectual/artistic

>existence is a work.

>2. The fusion of several distinct works is a different work.

I say yes to 1, and yes in some cases to 2 -- it depends on what you understand by "fusion", and as you have noticed I'm not inclined to consider Maire-Louise's W1 and W3 or W2 and W3 sufficiently "fused" to constitute W4 and W5. You can still read the lyrics without the music, and you can still listen to, or hum, the tune without expressing the lyrics.

But again -- I'm not dead sure!

Biblioteksråd / Deputy director

Avdelningen för Insamling & Dokumentation (IDA) /

Head, Department for Collection Development & Documentation

Kungl. biblioteket

Box 5031

S-102 41 Stockholm Sweden

tel.+46 8 463 41 54

fax.+46 8 463 43 81

e-mail gunilla.jonsson@kb.se

Janifer Gatenby, 23/01/2003, 14:37

Re: FW: FRBR and songs

I would hesitate to separate song lyrics from their melodies systematically. To define the works, I think that the sequence is important. Most songs first appear with both. The work therefore consists of the two. If someone then reuses those lyrics with a different melody then the that is another work. I would suggest the following:

Case 1: A new melody is made for an existing song.

W1 Melody 1 Lyrics 1

W2 Melody 2 Lyrics 1

Case 2: New lyrics are made for an existing song

W1 Melody 1 Lyrics 1

FRBR Listserv Archive

W2 Melody 1 Lyrics 2

Case 3: A melody is made for an existing poem

W1 Poem (to be lyrics)
W2 Melody 1 and Poem
W3 Melody 2 and Poem
etc.

Case 4: A musical work (instrumental) is made into a song with lyrics

W1 Musical work
W2 Music Lyrics 1
W3 Music Lyrics 2
etc.

Lyrics are not separate works unless they existed in their own right before being associated with a tune. If I read the words "Sometimes all I need is the air that I breathe in.." I start humming the tune.

Similarly for melodies.

Janifer

Janifer Gatenby

Consultant OCLC PICA ITC

Schipholweg 99, 2300 AW Leiden, The Netherlands

+ 31 71 524 65 00

+ 31 71 522 31 19 (fax)

janifer.gatenby@oclc-pica.nl

Patrick Le Beuf, 23/01/2003, 15:13

Re: FRBR and songs

Dear all,

I think that Marie-Louise's and Dan's arguments pose at a higher level the more general problem of "composite works" and "juxtaposed" works, a problem that is not encountered in a FRBR context only, but that also proved to be quite a tricky thing for the definition of international standard numbers.

By "composite works", I mean: works that were originated on the basis of one or more than one preexisting work, that could not have been originated such as they stand without that/those preexisting work(s), but that may in some cases be expressed without any reference to that/those preexisting work(s). Examples: an opera (and more generally any kind of vocal music), a movie, Christo's wrappings, calligraphies. In my opinion (and I know that David Miller shares this opinion), performances of plays on stage belong to that category, but this is controversial.

By "juxtaposed works", I mean: works that happen to be materialized in a single manifestation though they may not have been intended for that purpose. Examples: "Shakespeare's Tragedies", "Three Jacobean plays", illustrations for a text (in many cases the text was not intended to be combined with illustrations but the illustrations were solely intended to accompany the text).

Shall we regard "juxtaposed works" as new, distinct works ("1 + 1 = 1")? As a matter of fact, this is what we often currently do with our cataloguing rules such as they stand (the main entry for "Shakespeare's Tragedies" will be: [100] Shakespeare, William (1564-1616). - [245] Shakespeare's Tragedies). And this is what the ISTC standard allows one to do (though it is not mandatory). And this is what OCLC's experimental FictionFinder seems to do (cf. http://staff.oclc.org/~vizine/CNI/OCLCFRBR_files/frame.htm slide #18). It is not quite clear from FRBR Final Report whether an illustrated text, or a text published together with a foreword, should be regarded as a mere expression of a textual work, as a new work, or as two distinct works that happen to share one single manifestation.

"Composite works" (which I like to call "onion-like works", or "imbricated works") should definitely be regarded on the whole as distinct works. But the tricky question is: should we regard the result of the modification of one component of such

FRBR Listserv Archive

"onion-like works" as new works or as mere expressions of these composite works? As Martha M. Yee has pointed out (http://www.ala.org/editions/samplers/sampler_pdfs/connell_future.pdf p. 81-82, but the whole chapter is worth reading and relevant to Marie-Lousie's question), "God save the Queen" does not appeal as much to an American citizen as "America", though the tune is the same: are these two works, or two expressions of the same work? If it is only one work, what should the title of this work be? and what should the citation for each expression read like? (I don't expect American users to be satisfied with something like "[God save the King] (version: America (lyrics))"). In addition, my PowerPoint presentation mentioned in Marie-Louise's paper listed some of the many other lyrics that were sung on that same tune, and the trouble raises when it comes to establish a relationship between Beethoven's Variations on God save the King and Charles Ives' Variations on America. And when Leonard Bernstein had his singers replace "Freude" with "Freiheit" in Beethoven's 9th symphony, did that result in the origination of a new work, "Ode to Liberty", instead of "Ode to Joy"? And what about scores with several alternative texts, eg operas with translated librettos that were carefully designed as to perfectly fit the music? And there are very early examples, such as this mediaeval score: (See attached file: Sumer_is_icumen_in.jpg) Here, the same tune may be sung either in mediaeval English or in Latin (though the lyrics do not express the same "ideational content" at all in each language). But the "work" is widely known as "Sumer is icumen in", more than "Perspice Christicola". So, "Perspice Christicola" is only an "expression" of "Sumer is icumen in" as a musical work, though a distinct work of its own as a textual work?

We can pose the general problem this way: "Does a new expression of an imbricated work result in the origination of a new expression of the containing work, or in a new, distinct work?"

Just like Gunilla, I have more question marks than definite answers. This is right the kind of issues we have to address in the IFLA FRBR WG and in this listserv.

Best wishes,
Patrick

Barbara Tillett, 23/01/2003, 21:34

Re: Re: FRBR and songs

It's very tempting to analyze things and deconstruct, but we need to remember what we're trying to accomplish, what objectives for the catalog do we have in taking any steps? If we want to collocate (group together) works, there are traditions of what we consider works for that purpose. We have used various devices over the ages to relate works and the bibliographic records for the manifestations that contain the works and expressions, such as main entries, added entries, uniform titles, etc.

We may wish to make separate records for the separate works (whether as aggregations/composites/collections or single works or even a component of a work, if there is a user need) and link them. We also may choose to relate the records for manifestations that have something in common that our users would find valuable, certainly the same content (work), but also in some cases a component of the work in common: the same tune, the same lyrics, the same illustrations, etc.

However, we also need to keep in mind the economics of cataloging - we must base our decisions about links and relationships and records for parts of a whole work on what the cataloger can easily perceive from the item in hand (or on their computer) and not require extensive reference work and analysis to find out hidden relationships. If a particular relationship is discovered later, then the library should have a policy about whether or not to add it for their users, based on some easy to understand criteria.

So far we do not have a structure to build FRBR records as such - we can identify some parts of the current bibliographic, authority, and holdings records that contain elements of each of the 4 Group 1 entities, but we now must make do with other devices to accomplish the objective of collocation, in addition to the FRBR user tasks of find, identify, select, and obtain. We even can turn our existing OPAC displays into something more FRBR-like, using the elements in existing records. But our current systems do not build records on the FRBR model - where do we want to go with the model? - bt

FRBR Listserv Archive

Gunilla Jonsson, 24/01/2003, 15:19

Re: Re: FRBR and songs

Dear all, this analysing is a very enjoyable, intellectual game - and it is not unimportant. But! -- I was actually going to write a mail exactly along the lines that Barbara has done below, only Barbara got before me. I can only say that I couldn't agree more with what Barbara says. The main objective is to facilitate for our users, and what level of specification as to aggregated works we will need is really depending on what our users are asking for. We may have collections of poems where every single poem needs its own work record and other collections for which no one ever will request anything but the whole. The main thing is Barbara's bottom line, we need systems which allow us to build records on the FRBR model. Flexible systems, which will not force us into tasks not asked for but which can expand in whatever direction is needed!
Have a nice weekend, all of you,
Gunilla

Dan Matei, 24/01/2003, 16:57

Re: RE: FRBR and songs

Dear Barbara & Gunilla

I fully agree with you: we need a flexible and pragmatic approach. But: the discussion here is among "theorists", right. So:

a) it's fun (as Gunilla said);

b) it's useful: my math teacher in the high school used to say: "if we go to the limit, we see more clear". I.e. we deconstruct/construct/reconstruct/de-reconstruct in order to detect the "principles"; we do not expect every cataloguer to do the same, all the time (only sometimes :-).

On the other hand I think we need to recognize (even it is not politically correct :-)) that the cataloguer has to exercise judgment all the time, I mean 'value judgment'. E.g. we will detach the lyrics from the music only if it is worth. Otherwise, I do not expect to have a work-record for:

"Obla di, obla da ...",

not even for

"Somebody loves me,

It's wonderful.

Maybe it's you."

Nor for the lyrics-free music of (most) rap pieces.

So, I'm afraid, the cataloguer's "value-blindness", i.e. "objectivity" is gone also in theory (in practice ...).

> request anything but the whole. The main thing is Barbara's

> bottom line, we need systems which allow us to build records

> on the FRBR model. Flexible systems, which will not force us

> into tasks not asked for but which can expand in whatever

> direction is needed!

By 'systems' you mean software? It's easy to make the software to accept "variable depth" cataloguing. More difficult is for the cataloguing procedures (and ideologies). This is why I'm beginning to prefer "guidelines" instead of "rules". Rules are rules, and do not encourage flexibility.

Cheers,

Dan

PS. I'm not absolutely sure of (almost)nothing I said !

Dan Matei, director

CIMEC - Institutul de Memorie Culturala [Institute for Cultural Memory]

Piata Presei Libere nr. 1, CP 33-90,

713411 Bucuresti [Bucharest], Romania

tel/fax (+40-21) 224 37 42

www.cimec.ro

FRBR Listserv Archive

Gunilla Jonsson, 24/01/2003, 17:19

Re: Re: FRBR and songs

Just a short reply before I leave office for the weekend, I do agree with your thoughts about guidelines, Dan. I use to stress that the first requirement when you are going to catalogue something is knowledge of the material you are dealing with, knowledge of what production and dissemination processes that have affected it and of the type of intellectual content you are dealing with, next comes understanding of why and for what purpose you are cataloguing it, only last comes knowledge of the rules. Because you can not apply the rules with good judgement without the two first requirements. Unfortunately, my experience with cataloguers is largely that it is difficult to bring about that attitude in them. But I am trying every day!
Again, a nice weekend,
Gunilla

Dan Matei, 29/01/2003, 09:58

Re: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Dear all

Re-reading the FRBR report, I realized I have a problem:

What is a "tower" (or "building" or "fork", whatever) ? In the FRBR-sense, "tower" is a concept (i.e. an abstraction designating a class of objects) ? A record for "tower" is in the "concept" entity ?

Recall:

3.2.7 Concept

The seventh entity defined in the model is concept: an abstract notion or idea.

The entity defined as concept encompasses a comprehensive range of abstractions that may be the subject of a work: fields of knowledge, disciplines, schools of thought (philosophies, religions, political ideologies, etc.), theories, processes, techniques, practices, etc. A concept may be broad in nature or narrowly defined and precise.

Examples

- Economics
- Romanticism
- Hydroponics
- Supply-side economics

[page 25, in the pdf manifestation]

I do not see "classes of objects" within the "range of abstractions", nor in the examples.

On the other hand:

3.2.8 Object

The eighth entity defined in the model is object: a material thing. The entity defined as object encompasses a comprehensive range of material things that may be the subject of a work: animate and inanimate objects occurring in nature; fixed, movable, and moving objects that are the product of human creation; objects that no longer exist.

Examples

- Buckingham Palace
- The Lusitania
- Apollo 11
- The Eiffel Tower

[page 26]

I see here, in the examples, only members of classes: palaces, ships, space ships, towers. And the definition seems to me to indicate only instances, i.e. individual, identifiable objects.

So. "Towers" belongs to 'concept' and "The Eiffel Tower" belongs to 'object' ?

FRBR Listserv Archive

On this hypothesis, I tried to re-build the FRBR model in an object-oriented formalism (i.e. in UML), adding only a few elements. I attach-it.

Comments and criticism are welcome !

Dan

PS. In the picture, the solid arrow means "generalization".

Gerhard Riesthuis, 29/01/2003, 15:35

Re: Re: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Dear all,

I agree fully with Dan that the concepts "Concept" and "Object" are not very clear defined in FRBR. I have concluded from the context that "classes of objects" are to be considered as objects also. And logically we can consider "Castles" as theme of a work as the set of all individual castles. A question here is what is the significance of the distinction between "Concept" and "Object" ? Is a "concept" always abstract? I would like to combine "Object" and "Concept" in the drawing into one entity. I don't like the notion of "Object" as a instance of a "Concept". That would mean that a "concept" can also be a concrete, such as "Castle" as a thought model unattached from any concrete castle.

Gerhard Riesthuis

Barbara Tillett, 29/01/2003, 13:26

Re: Re: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Please don't forget that all of the Group 1 and Group entities can also be the subject of a work, so you need more arrows to "entity" box. - bt

Patrick Le Bœuf, 29/01/2003, 13:41

Re: Reminder: "Sharing the knowledge" Symposium in Washington

Dear all,

It is my pleasure to remind you of the International CIDOC CRM Symposium "Sharing the Knowledge" that is to take place in Washington on March 26-27. The program is now available from http://cidoc.ics.forth.gr/symposium_program.htm). This is a great opportunity to meet with members of the CRM and the ABC communities and to exchange views about information treatment in both library and museum communities.

Best wishes,

Patrick

Dan Matei, 29/01/2003, 15:45

Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

> Please don't forget that all of the Group 1 and Group
> entities can also be the subject of a work, so you need more
> arrows to "entity" box. - bt

I meant all entities to be "entity"-s, i.e. 'Item' has as generalization 'Object', which has as generalization "entity";

'Place', 'Event', 'Concept', have (directly) as generalization "entity" (solid arrows to the "entity" box);

'Person', 'Corporate body' have as generalization 'agent' which has as generalization "entity";

'Work', 'Expression', 'Manifestation' have as generalization 'Abstraction' (I'm not sure it is a useful "proxy", but saves some lines :-), which has as generalization "entity".

So, a work having 'entity' as subject, has everything as subject.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Do I miss something ?
Dan

Patrick Le Bœuf, 29/01/2003, 19:02

Re: Mapping from CRM to FRBR

Dear all,
Here is a first draft of a mapping from CRM to FRBR. The intention in producing such a document is to promote interoperability between museum catalogues and library catalogues.
As it is a first draft, it is necessarily not perfect. Any comments and suggestions are welcome.
Best wishes,
Patrick
(See attached file: Mapping_CRM_FRBR.doc)

Dan Matei, 04/02/2003, 16:29

Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Dear all
I insert a good comment from Martin (with his kind permission), beside Gerhard's (see the 2-nd part of the message). I also attach two new versions of the "FRBR core" model.
I think it is more comfortable (in the context of this model) to consider the 'concept' class to encompass only the "generic", abstract notions and ideas, [pragmatically] expressed as common names and not proper names. 'Agent', 'abstraction', 'place', 'event' are expressed as proper names, but classes of these kind of things are concepts, so all can have a type in the 'concept' class.
On the other hand, I confess I introduced 'abstraction' (just as an "abstract" class) in order to save arrows in the picture, i.e. it has not too much "semantic substance". I'm not sure that 'work', 'expression', 'manifestation' have some attributes in common (which are not common also to the other entities), as to "move" them in the 'abstraction' class and so to justify the "invention" of an extra table in a database schema. I guess - for instance - that the attribute 'title' is shared by 'work' and 'expression' (they have the same content model (?)), but not with 'manifestation' where 'title and statement of responsibility' has a much more sophisticated content model.
BTW. This model - seems to me - is not an ontology proper, nor a pure operational model (which is the complement of 'ontology' ?). It's a mixture.
On the 3-rd hand, Martin's suggestion to use 'has type' relation (i.e. CIDOC CRM style) to replace 'is instance of' is welcome. It is more intuitive, being of the same nature. So, this could be a solution to Gerhard's objection to consider 'object' an instance of 'concept'.
On the 4-th hand, I'm also happy with Martin's suggestion to "revert" the 'is exemplified by' relation between 'manifestation' and 'item' with 'is instance of' relation between 'item' and 'manifestation' ('manifestation' being a genuine class of 'items'). Again, it is more intuitive to me.
To be honest, I guess it could be even better to relate by 'has type' the 'entity' class with the 'concept' class and to eliminate 'abstraction'. The only difference would be that 'concept' would also be related by 'has type' to itself. And this is OK, I guess. BTW. The 'related to' relation between 'concept's, is a generic term for both broader-type relations and all kind of other relations. So, this is version 3 of FrbrCore OO model.
In an orthodox version of the model, I think that every object which is an artifact should be seen as a work-expression-manifestation-item suite. So it should 'have type' via its 'work' "facet", not directly.
That is, only the ecofacts 'object's should have directly a 'has type' relation with the 'concept' class. (I suppose we can do without work-expression-manifestation in the case of the "Tungus Meteorite".)

FRBR Listserv Archive

But, IMHO, that orthodox view would be an overkill. Thus - to use Gerhard's case - in our pragmatic model, most of the castles (being used only as subjects) could be recorded only as 'item's, i.e. 'object's , ignoring their work-expression-manifestation facets.

[after 24 hours]

I reconsider the second part of the last paragraph. I'm afraid that some ecofacts deserve also the work-expression-manifestation-item representation, on pragmatic grounds. If € the example is supposed to amuse you € the Tungus Meteorite is present in my collection as a) the actual object, b) several pictures, c) many 3-D virtual reconstructions, d) etc. then I could be interested to give it the full (FRBR) treatment.

I realized now: in the previous paragraph I had a metaphysical reasoning. I € unintentionally € positively "discriminated" the artifacts, due to the "human factor", (i.e. "creation") involved. Sorry :-)

Dan

> I see you have reached the level of metaclass modelling. You represent "Concept" as a class of classes = metaclass. We
> do basically the same in the CIDOC CRM, all classes of factual items are regarded instances of "Type", which is a
> specialization of "Conceptual Object". We hide the instantiation behind the link "has type", which is a workaround to
> make metaclasses manageable in a normal database system. Note that Manifestation is equally a metaclass! and that "is
> exemplified by" is another work around of "is instance of", actually it is linguistically equivalent. I'd make
> Manifestation ISA Concept rather than ISA Abstraction.
> Other authors regard the "materialization" of a technical plan like the printing instructions for a particular book as a
> particular case of instantiation, called "materialization". If Manifestation is not regarded a concept, then there would
> be metaclasses which are not concepts. Then an edition with ten thousand items produced would be of different nature
> from a set of Roman oil lamps of the same type? On the other side, an edition can be subject of a book or not?
> We believe however, that there are concepts which are not metaclasses, and that expressions and works are actually
> concepts, but not metaclasses. But this may be irrelevant for FRBR.
> Martin
> I agree fully with Dan that the concepts "Concept" and
> "Object" are not
> very clear defined in FRBR. I have concluded from the context
> that "classes
> of objects" are to be considered as objects also. And
> logically we can
> consider "Castles" as theme of a work as the set of all
> individual castles. A question here is what is the
> significance of the distinction between
> "Concept" and "Object" ? Is a "concept" always abstract? I
> would like to
> combine "Object" and "Concept" in the drawing into one
> entity. I don't like
> the notion of "Object" as a instance of a "Concept". That
> would mean that a
> "concept" can also be a concrete, such as "Castle" as a thought model
> unattached from any concrete castle.
> Gerhard Riesthuis
> Dr. Gerhard J.A. Riesthuis
> Universiteit van Amsterdam
> Leerstoelgroep Informatiewetenschap
> Oude Turfmarkt 147 1012 GC Amsterdam
> Tel: +31 20 525 2295 Fax: +31 20 525 2097
> Privé tel.: + 31 20 69 11 807

FRBR Listserv Archive

> For ISKO matters: e-mail: ISKO@hum.uva.nl

Barbara Tillett, 06/02/2003, 15:21

Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Dan - I still am having trouble with your pictures, but unfortunately have no time just now to give you a reasoned response - so this is just a quick note to let you know I will try to get back to you before the end of this month (when I return from travelling on business). Basically I still would like to see the direct link to show that Group 1 entities and Group 2 entities can also be subjects of works. I don't understand the value of intermediate boxes for "entity" and "abstraction" - Barbara

Patrick Le Bœuf, 13/02/2003, 13:41

Re: The "IFLA FRBR WG Web Site" now available from IFLANET!

Dear all,

I am pleased to announce that, thanks to Kerstin Dahl and Sophie Felfoldi, our Web Site devoted to FRBR and FRBR studies is now available at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/wgfrbr.htm>. Do not hesitate to have a look at it and to send suggestions for its improvement, and electronic Manifestations of new Works and Expressions to enhance its content ; -)

I would like to warmly thank Kerstin and Sophie who were instrumental in this achievement.

Best wishes,

Patrick

Patrick Le Bœuf, 18/02/2003, 14:42

Re: Update

Dear all,

An updated version of the FRBR bibliography (<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/bibliography.htm>) has just been made available on the FRBR WG's Web site, thanks to Sophie Felfoldi and Kerstin Dahl.

Please tell me if you notice any omission!

As far as I know, the 'FRBR Final Report' is now available in English, Czech, French, Italian, Norwegian, Slovenian, and perhaps also Japanese (I'm not quite sure about Japanese); don't hesitate to notify me if you are aware of any other translation.

Best wishes,

Patrick

Dan Matei, 19/02/2003, 09:48

Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Dear Barbara & friends

> Basically I still would like to see the direct link to show

> that Group 1 entities and Group 2 entities can also be

> subjects of works. I don't understand the value of

> intermediate boxes for "entity" and "abstraction" - Barbara

Each and every entity in group 1 & 2 are subclasses of the class 'entity' (which is an abstraction of all), i.e. it groups the common properties of all, in particular the "is subject of" relationship (the reciprocal of 'has as subject'). (BTW. this way of abstracting is one of the beauties of the object-oriented formalism).

On the other hand, I attach the 4-th version of the "FRBR core" model (my guess is that we will have 23 versions), in which I dropped the 'object' entity. ('abstraction' was killed already in version 3 :-). After a (not so) long reflection, I decided that

FRBR Listserv Archive

the 'item' entity is enough and it can replace successfully 'object'. What do you all think ?

Dan

PS. I hope you will appreciate the progression toward essence in this model :-)

Patrick Le Bœuf, 19/02/2003, 10:16

Re: Dan's OO translation of FRBR

Dear Dan (and Dear all),

I think the Object entity should remain in the model as a super-class of Item. Any instance of Item also is an instance of Object (even an electronic file (?)), but not every instance of Object is an instance of Item (e.g. realia: stones, twigs, leaves...) (except perhaps in Natural History museums, but in that context CRM would be a more relevant model than FRBR).

Besides, I think that Work, Expression and Manifestation should be declared as sub-classes of Concept.

A translation of FRBR into OO formalism should, in my opinion, strongly rely on CRM and ABC, and also on some interesting suggestions made by XOBIS. And it also should, of course, take FRANAR into account. But it is a good thing to start right now to think about it.

Best wishes,

Patrick

Barbara Tillett, 19/02/2003, 16:00

Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

I agree with Patrick about item being a subset of Object, and that Object needs to be added back to your diagram. - bt

Maja Žumer, 20/02/2003, 15:58

Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Finally I also have to give my 5 tolars worth:

Object being one of the entities in the model of course has to be included. I am not sure, though, that we need to make item a subset of object and/or work, expression and manifestation subsets of concept. It is true that an item is by nature an object (in most cases?) and other 'bibliographic entities' are concepts, but the reason they are separate entities in the FRBR model is the fact that they are all products of intellectual and/or artistic efforts (what a formulation!; more about that some other time) and it is this particular aspect that we focus on (and describe them by), which makes them different from other objects and concepts.

I propose to keep them separate. What do we gain by collapsing them into other entities? To be consistent, we would have to make agents also subsets of both objects and concepts!

Maja Žumer

Patrick Le Bœuf, 03/03/2003, 14:26

Re: Announcement

Dear all,

It is my pleasure to announce that the proceedings of a FRBR Symposium that was organized by the National Library of France on December 5th, 2002, have just been made available from: <http://www.bnf.fr/pages/infopro/outibib/no-journee_FRBR.htm>. These proceedings include:

An Introduction by Marcelle Beaudiquez (in French),

A general presentation of FRBR and the issues related to the model, by Patrick Le Boeuf (in French and in an English translation by Pat Riva -- thank you very much,

FRBR Listserv Archive

Pat!) (this presentation includes copies of Jennifer Bowen's mock-up screens, with her authorization),
A demonstration of the VIRTUA system, by Murielle Voide (in French, but the English version is also available from VTLIS Inc.),
FRBR status of research and implementation at OCLC and OCLC PICA, by Janifer Gatenby (in English),
A presentation of AustLit Gateway, by Patrick Le Boeuf (examples in English, explanation in French),
FRBR and the revision of cataloguing codes, by Françoise Bourdon and Françoise Leresche (in French),
A prospective study on what catalogs might look like in the future thanks to FRBR, by Patrick Le Boeuf (in French; credits: this presentation includes quotations from Vicki Burns' presentation "Envisioning library service for Internet generation").
Best wishes,
Patrick

Martin Doerr, 06/03/2003, 18:44

Re: Sharing the Knowledge Symposium

*** Please circulate this announcement as appropriate ***
apologies for cross-posting!

Dear Colleague,

Please join us for "Sharing the Knowledge," the International CIDOC CRM Symposium on interoperability for cultural heritage information:

When:

26-27 March 2003

Where: S. Dillon Ripley International Center

Smithsonian Institution

1100 Jefferson Drive SW

Washington, DC 20560, USA

Cost:

Free! No registration required.

Info:

<http://cidoc.ics.forth.gr/workshops.html#symposium>

This event will bring together a diverse range of knowledge managers and researchers with a common interest in facilitating information exchange between museums, libraries, archives and beyond.

The full program will include speakers from museums, academia, government and industry, and is now available in draft form on the website at http://cidoc.ics.forth.gr/symposium_program.htm

Invited speakers are Thomas Gruber, Carl Lagoze, Amit Sheth and Bhavani Thuraisingham.

There will also be an opportunity to learn more about the CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model, which provides a formal structure for describing the concepts and relationships used in cultural heritage documentation. A free pre-symposium tutorial session is being provided from 9:00am - noon on Wednesday 26th March.

Once again, there is NO COST to attend this event, which is open to anyone interested in the exchange of cultural documentation. Attendees are responsible for their own travel, accommodation and subsistence costs. The Best Western Capitol Hill is about 5 blocks from the S. Dillon Ripley International Center. You may find the following web resources useful in arranging accommodation:

<http://www.washingtonhotels.com/>

<http://www.hotels.com/>

We look forward to seeing you in Washington!

Dr. Martin Doerr

Information Systems Laboratory

Institute of Computer Science

Foundation for Research and Technology - Hellas (FORTH)

Vassilika Vouton, P.O.Box1385, GR71110 Heraklion, Crete, Greece

Paulo Leitão, 07/03/2003, 20:15

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: FRBR model and Subject Gateways

Dear All,

My name is Paulo Leitão. I'am a portuguese librarian and I'am doing a master thesis in digital libraries. My subject is: organization of information in the context of the Subject Gateways - RDN (Resource discovery network).

After reviewing those services, I intent to dicuss the feasability of FRBR model for organizing the information in such a context. What do you think about it?

Best Regards

Paulo

Barbara Tillett, 10/03/2003, 13:39

Re: Re: FRBR model and Subject Gateways

Great idea! The collocation capabilities (for grouping together displays of bibliographic records) that FRBR supports goes back to basic objectives of library catalogs. There are already several systems and test prototypes that are using FRBR, so I'm sure you will be citing those in your work. Best wishes - Barbara Tillett

Dr. Barbara B. Tillett, Ph.D.

Chief, Cataloging Policy and Support Office

Library of Congress

101 Independence Ave., S.E.

Washington, D.C. 20540-4305

U.S.A.

tel.: +1 (202) 707-4714

fax: +1 (202) 707-6629

email: btil@loc.gov

John Espley, 02/05/2003, 9h12

Re: Expressions

As most of you probably know VTLS has implemented FRBR in its most recent version of Virtua. In working on this project some questions about FRBR Expressions have been raised. I'm sure that anybody who has worked with FRBR knows that Expressions are one of the most difficult parts of FRBR.

The general question is what constitutes a new Expression?

A more specific question that came up when I was FRBRizing the Humphry Clinker records used by Ed O'Neill of OCLC was: are microforms a different Expression from the "normal" print versions? Sound recordings of a book are obviously (?) a different Expression, but are microforms since they are also "alphanumeric notation" that just need special equipment to read them. I also been assuming that Braille would constitute a new Expression even if it was still in the same language (normal English text versus English Braille).

So, what about microforms? Different Expression from the normal "alphanumeric notation"?

I also have been very interested in the articles produced by OCLC about FRBR. But I'm concerned that the definition being used for Expressions is too strict. The final report on FRBR does state:

"Inasmuch as the form of expression is an inherent characteristic of the expression, any change in form (e.g., from alpha-numeric notation to spoken word) results in a new expression. Similarly, changes in the intellectual conventions or instruments that are employed to express a work (e.g., translation from one language to another) result in the production of a new expression. Strictly speaking, any change in intellectual or artistic content constitutes a change in expression. Thus, if a text is revised or modified, the resulting expression is considered to be a new expression, no matter how minor the modification may be."

Which, if followed exactly as stated, would mean that any change in the text or presentation of the text would constitute a new Expression. The addition of illustrations (or different illustrations), a preface, an afterword, an introduction, or an editor would mean a new Expression. The simultaneous publication of a book in the United States and Great Britain would mean a new Expression if

FRBR Listserv Archive

American and English versions of words were used in their respective publications (color versus colour and so forth).

Of course, the FRBR Final Report also states (in the very next paragraph):

"On a practical level, the degree to which bibliographic distinctions are made between variant expressions of a work will depend to some extent on the nature of the work itself, and on the anticipated needs of users. Differences in form of expression (e.g., the differences between the expression of a work in the form of musical notation and the expression of the same work in the form of recorded sound) will normally be reflected in the bibliographic record, no matter what the nature of the work itself may be. Variant expressions in the same form (e.g., revised versions of a text) will often be indirectly identified as different expressions because the variation is apparent from the data associated with an attribute used to identify the manifestation in which the expression is embodied (e.g., an edition statement). Variations that would be evident only from a more detailed analysis and comparison of expressions (e.g., variations between several of the early texts of Shakespeare's Hamlet) would normally be reflected in the data only if the nature or stature of the work warranted such analysis, and only if it was anticipated that the distinction would be important to users. "

So if we follow that paragraph would we need different Expressions when the "text" of the original document is the same, but there are differences in various manifestations because of the addition of illustrations (or different illustrations), preface, afterword, introduction, or an editor? If we follow a more "looser" definition of Expressions, would not the problems presented by Ed O'Neill in his paper "FRBR: Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, Application of the Entity-Relationship Model to Humphry Clinker" be greatly reduced?

Comments?

John L. Espley
VTLS Inc.

"The more I know, The more I know, I ought to know."

William Denton, 02/05/2003, 8:09

Re: Student paper on FRBR

I'm a student at the Faculty of Information Studies at the University of Toronto, and in the term just finished I took a course on the theory of classification and knowledge organization with Prof. Clare Beghtol. We didn't actually discuss FRBR in class, but I was quite intrigued with what little I'd read about it, so I did my final paper on it. I looked at Panizzi, Cutter, Lubetzky, and Ranganathan, how a FRBR catalogue would embody their core principles, and a bit about what current work was being done on it.

I really enjoyed reading articles about it, and the specification too, though I admit I skipped the tables at the back. I cited M. Le Boeuf's "FRBR and Further" and some OCLC articles, including the new one from Bennett, Lavoie, and O'Neill that was recently mentioned. The list archives and the FRBR bibliography were a great help in finding sources.

Reading the late Seymour Lubetzky's articles was also very interesting. Before I heard about FRBR, I hadn't come across the idea of a work as an abstract entity, and Lubetzky and the FRBR spec lay out what could make a really useful catalogue, much better than I've ever used. I hope to see one in action soon.

Bill

--William Denton : Toronto, Canada : <http://www.miskatonic.org/> : Caveat lector.

David Miller, 02/05/2003, 13:33

Re: Student paper on FRBR

Dear Bill:

Thanks so much for sharing your posting. Perhaps I'm not the only person who would be interested in reading your paper. Might it be available in some form? I'd be happy to pay expenses of copying and mailing, if it's only available in paper.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Best wishes,
David Miller
Levin Library, Curry College
Milton, Mass. USA
dmiller@curry.edu

John Byrum Jr, 02/05/2003, 13:53
Re: Student paper on FRBR

I too would like to read it. I am wondering if Bill could post it to this list or contributed to the FRBR Web site.

John D. Byrum, Jr.
Chief, Regional & Cooperative Cataloging
Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540-4380
USA
Tel: +(202) 707-6511
Fax: +(202) 707-2824

Joe Zeeman, 05/05/2003, 07:32
Re: FRBR Expressions

John;

If we consider that a new expression is created anytime someone says the words or plays the notes or types the characters or composes the lines of type, then I don't think that a microform, or any mechanical or photographic reproduction of printed text, creates a new expression, just as copying from a master recording doesn't create a new expression and copying the bits of a digital file don't create a new expression. They can be no more than new manifestations.

The quote you give from OCLC is strictly true and I would certainly consider a text with new illustrations to be a new expression (since the user's experience of the work is altered by the difference in illustration). The boundary conditions are, of course, difficult, since some new expressions are more significant than others. I think we would all have a gut feeling that there is a bigger difference between a Shakespeare play edited by two different scholars than between two editions of the same redaction that have typos and minor infelicities corrected. And that to record both of these as simple new expressions doesn't capture an important distinction. I would rather like to use the AACR approach and treat editions that are "substantially" the same as different manifestations of a single expression. Unfortunately this brings us back to a reliance on catalogers' judgement.

English vs American editions of the same text represent an interesting case. I am aware that editions of Harry Potter published in the US differ substantially in their diction from those published in the UK (my daughter, the H.P. fanatic, would be able to give details - I can't). This, rather than differences in orthography, would seem to make the case for their being different expressions.

Joe Zeeman
(not speaking for)
RLG

William Denton, 05/05/2003, 09:36
Re: Student paper on FRBR

Hello,
Thanks for all the interest in my essay, an interest I hope my professor shares. If it gets a decent mark, I'll put it up on my web site and let you know.
Bill

William Denton : Toronto, Canada : <http://www.miskatonic.org/> : Caveat lector.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Maja Žumer, 05/05/2003, 16:22
Re: FRBR Expressions

Dear colleagues,

In all discussions of FRBR people come to the conclusion that 'expression is a problem'. It seems to be so for different reasons. In addition to the ones brought up by John, there is also concern that it may be difficult to use the expression level for intellectual rights and that it is not quite appropriate to describe digital resources. Gunilla Jonsson discussed last year at IFLA the problem of literary criticism and why and how the expression level is not appropriate. And there are other concerns. I believe it would be useful to bring together all of them and try to find solutions.

There is something else I would like to comment now. It is not the first time I see the illustrated version of a text listed as a new expression. John writes:

"The addition of illustrations (or different illustrations), a preface, an afterword, an introduction, or an editor would mean a new Expression."

This I believe is not true. All these are examples of new manifestations in which SEVERAL expressions are combined. Illustrations, preface, afterword... are all separate works (usually by another author) and therefore separate expressions. In some cases (but definitely not always) we may even discuss whether combining, putting together (e.g. text and pictures, several texts) is another work (i.e. original intellectual effort). Anthologies are an obvious example. Therefore many (most?) manifestations actually contain several expressions. But as long as the text is not changed it is the same expression regardless of what it is 'packaged' with.

Any comments? I hope I made myself clear... even if it shows that I am not a native speaker :-)

Best regards

Maja Zumer
National and University Library
Ljubljana
Slovenia

Allyson Carlyle, 06/05/2003, 09:33
Re: FRBR Expressions

Ahh, interesting. I have heard varying interpretations of expression - some who would agree that saying the words or playing the notes comprises a new expression, but that retyping the SAME characters as the original or composing new lines of type (using the SAME characters as the original) would not be a new expression.

Is there a consensus about this? Who decides?

Thanks,
Allyson

Allyson Carlyle
Associate Dean for Academics
Information School
University of Washington
Box 352840
Seattle, WA 98195
USA

Allyson Carlyle, 06/05/2003, 09:33
Re: FRBR Expressions

Maja,

I am so glad you posted this, and you made yourself very clear. I've been thinking for a while that your way of looking at this is a cleaner way to think of what Richard Smiraglia calls "augmentation" (I'm going by memory here - someone correct me if I've misremembered!). Augmentations such as introductions, prefaces, & illustrations created for a particular text may be thought of as works that are related to the work

FRBR Listserv Archive

with which they are packaged physically. Something like an anthology is a bit different, unless the individual works were created specifically to be published together.

Unfortunately, the theoretical clarity of this model muddies up the practical water (at least, I think it does), given that we have never described these augmentations separately. It may simply be easier (although still difficult, given current cataloging practice) to treat the addition of these separate works as a trigger for a new expression. The biggest problem I see with this (right now!) is that if, say, the illustrations were published separately, how would they be treated? As a part of the original expression in which they appeared? Or ???

Allyson

Allyson Carlyle

Associate Dean for Academics

Information School

University of Washington

Box 352840

Seattle, WA 98195

USA

Marie-Louise Ayres, 06/05/2003, 09:36

Re: FRBR Expressions

Dear Maja

I agree with your proposition that 'these are examples of new manifestations in which SEVERAL expressions are combined. Illustrations, preface, afterword... are all separate works (usually by another author) and therefore separate expressions'. but as ever there will be user needs to take into account. In the AustLit Gateway (a custom built FRBR aware database), *most* 'composite' items are handled as manifestations containing multiple Works/Expressions/Manifestations. Anthologies (and collected works) are considered as works/expressions/manifestations in their own right (they have a 'creation' event, after all), which contain manifestations of a number of other works/expressions. Similarly, a new edition of a previously published novel - in which the intellectual content of the novel itself has not changed, but which includes, for example, a new introduction - is handled as a manifestation which contains two works/expressions/manifestations - the novel and the introduction.

There are practical issues here though. Even in our custom built environment, we made some practical decisions on this score. For example, we only described a preface or introduction separately if it was 'substantial' - effectively, a piece of literary criticism or biography in its own right. And although AustLit includes children's literature, and supports the delineation of multiple creators for a work (i.e. author and illustrator), we didn't go further down the path and actually describe illustrations as works in their own right - although we know that logically, this is the case, and can point to practical examples where artworks used to illustrate a children's book were separately owned and exhibited.

Some on this list will remember my earlier musings on songs, which logically include two works - the lyric and the score. In a perfect world, with a custom built FRBR aware database, these two works would be described separately, and if expressions of those works happen to be manifested in the same sheet music publication, then that's great, but you'd also be able to represent instances where either or both of the two works were expressed and manifested in other contexts.

The problem is that for most of the FRBR work we can imagine doing in the next 10 or more years, we will be aiming to do the best we can with traditional manifestation level cataloguing records, which do not disambiguate, for example, a lyric from a score, or a text from its illustrations. That being the case, I suspect that expression *will* continue to be problematic, and that we will probably make pragmatic decisions to denote new manifestations as new expressions, simply because we will be unable to say 'well, actually, this is just a new manifestation of that lyric, combined with a new expression of that score'.

Cheers

Marie-Louise

Dr Marie-Louise Ayres

Project Manager, Music Australia

FRBR Listserv Archive

National Library of Australia
Parkes ACT 2600
Email: mayres@nla.gov.au
Phone: +61 2 6262 1536
Fax: +61 2 6273 5081

Martin Doerr, 06/05/2003, 14:04
Re: RE: FRBR: what is a 'tower' ?

Dear All,
I had continued this dialogue with Maja, when I got the following questions from Maja:
Maja Žumer wrote:

.....
> In fact I would like to focus on another very much related issue:
> why are we developing this particular OO model? What are we
> trying to accomplish? To clarify the original FRBR model? To make
> it better understood by non-librarians? To get ready for the
> actual OO implementation? Other reasons? I believe the answer to
> this question is essential.
> Best regards
> Maja

As I am not part of the FRBR working group, I can only answer on behalf of myself:
From the point of view of the CIDOC CRM Special Interest Group, the ultimate goal is to connect library, archive and museum knowledge. An object-oriented model, with the qualities of a formal ontology, provides a common language to disambiguate meaning and to identify overlap and shared concepts between different metadata and data models. We are convinced, that this is currently the only viable method to integrate information in such a wide domain.

Based on such a model, various effective implementations can be done in a straightforward way, which typically do not use object-oriented middle-ware.

So for me:

It is not to get ready for an actual OO implementation, but for a set of implementations with semantic interoperability, no matter of what technology. The key is the unique interpretation of implemented data structures.

A model that represents FRBR as an idiosyncratic librarian's view without connection to other conceptualizations we share as humans is not helpful. We are interested in a model where the link into museum and archive information is explicit and well understood.

So it is to make FRBR better understood by non-librarians and make librarians better understand non-librarian concepts that relate to library information.

The current formulation of FRBR contains a few ambiguities, that could be clarified in a more formal ontological model.

In our Symposium in Washington we had the feeling, that there is enough ground and good reason to enforce collaboration between museum and library experts.

Therefore I would like to invite the FRBR working group to a common meeting with the CRM-SIG, where we could acquire a common understanding of the methodological issues of modelling our knowledge and in the sequence explore the possibility of direct collaboration and harmonized development.

(Please see also:

http://cidoc.ics.forth.gr/symposium_abstracts/list_of_abstracts.htm,

<http://jodi.ecs.soton.ac.uk/Articles/v04/i01/Doerr/>)

All the best,

Martin

Celine Noel, 06/05/2003, 17:58
Re: Expressions

Although I haven't read in detail all of the background documents for FRBR, the apparently universal problem with the "expression" level that comes out in all the discussion is, I think, trying to tell us something. My own opinion is that the fundamental flaw with the "expression" level is that it seems to be forcing us to

FRBR Listserv Archive

introduce content validation into cataloging, which is surely a doomed activity. To my mind, this level is moving us away from cataloging as being about bibliographic entities (issued when, issued by whom, etc.) to piecing together the creation history of all the parts and versions of the work itself. The practitioners among us know that when we are cataloging an item, we will never have all the other related versions of all of its pieces, or usually *any* related version for that matter, in hand to compare.

I think FRBR is an interesting model but I'm beginning to be concerned that the model seems to be wagging the data rather than the other way around. How necessary is the "expression" level to the model?

Celine Noel
UNC-Chapel Hill
cnoel@unc.edu

Sherman Clarke, 06/05/2003, 18:01

Re: RE: FRBR Expressions

> Is there a consensus about this? Who decides? [quoting Allyson Carlyle]

It is precisely this issue which drives me to think that we must work on FRBRizing our catalogs rather than our individual cataloging records. It is expeditious to build manifestation records because a record can be related to a specific item or items (multiple parts, multiple locations), the record can be sent to a bibliographic utility (e.g. OCLC, RLIN, consortial databases), the record can be migrated to a new library software.

The opac software should be trained (built) to build expressions and works from our manifestation records in combination with authority records for entities such as people, places and things. We will need to change our manifestation records to enable the software to FRBRize the hits but we don't necessarily have to build expression or work records in the bibliographic file.

Sherman Clarke
New York University Libraries
sherman.clarke@nyu.edu

Matthew Beacom, 06/05/2003, 18:02

Re: RE: FRBR Expressions

John,

Your questions have generated some useful comments already. I'll try to comment on some of your specific points.

1. Microforms and other reproductions are not new expressions, they are new manifestations of the same expression. A reproduction does not change the form of the expression or the content. If it does either, it fails to be a reproduction.

2. Sound records of a book are new expressions because the form of the expression has changed from written language to spoken language. Sound recordings by different readers are considered new expressions because we see the reading as a performance and think of performance as an interpretive act.

3. Braille is something I know nothing about. Is it just a different type face?

4. Any change in content may make a new expression, but not all changes in content are worth noticing. A new ed. of a novel that corrects some typos is not worth noting as a new expression. A revised ed. of a textbook--substantial new text, etc.--is worth noting as a new expression. Trivial changes should be ignored when deciding whether or not something is a new expression or a new manifestation of an existing expression. I don't think that deciding what is trivial will be that hard.

5. The comments made by others about prefaces, illustrations, etc. being other works that are package with the "main" work are very helpful. Many of the books, movies, songs, etc. that we have in our collections are complex objects (made of more than one work.) An introduction to a classic text by a noted scholar does not make a new expression of that classic text; however, the description we make may well note the introduction and its author is a part of the package and include a heading for the author of the introduction.

I hope this has been of some use.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Matthew Beacom

Joe Zeeman, 06/05/2003, 18:34

Re: RE: FRBR Expressions

Allyson;

I was almost certainly being over-subtle, but my point is that it is pretty well impossible, for anything but the shortest text, to retype the SAME characters as those in your copy. And when type is being composed (e.g. in the handpress period), it is absolutely impossible because of the exigencies of hairspacing and such need to make lines justify. Where it is important to have the identical text in subsequent typings, then expensive solutions, such as multiple typists and such are required. In practice, most of the time we don't need to bother identifying an edition reset from the copy of a previous edition as a new expression. Historical bibliographers and textual critics, however, do precisely this all the time - looking for those minor variants (changes in spelling, punctuation, etc.) and determining if they can be ascribed to the author or not.

As a corollary, two radically different manifestations (e.g. regular print and computer-generated audio) seem to me to belong to the same expression when they are generated from the same set of computer files with only style sheet differences, for example.

Both of these are boundary problems - there is not a clear theoretical boundary that can be drawn between the various FRBR objects. Most of the time the boundaries are obvious, but all too often they aren't. It's the cases when the boundaries are not obvious that make it so hard to come up with machine algorithms for FRBRizing MARC records or MARC-based catalogs.

j.

John Espley, 06/05/2003, 20:21

Re: RE: FRBR Expressions

I want to thank everybody who has responded to my questions about Expressions. The responses have all been very helpful. Some specific comments follow:

>1. Microforms and other reproductions are not new expressions, they are new
>manifestations of the same expression. A reproduction does not change the
>form of the expression or the content. If it does either, it fails to be a
>reproduction.

Good point. That's the way I was thinking it should be.

>2. Sound records of a book are new expressions because the form of the
>expression has changed from written language to spoken language. Sound
>recordings by different readers are considered new expressions because we
>see the reading as a performance and think of performance as an
>interpretive act.

That is certainly the way it reads in the Final Report.

>3. Braille is something I know nothing about. Is it just a different type face?

I have been considering Braille to be like a different language: that is a different expression. But I don't know for sure how to treat it. It might be English (or American) Braille but it is not anything that I (an English only speaker/reader) can read!

>4. Any change in content may make a new expression, but not all changes in
>content are worth noticing. A new ed. of a novel that corrects some typos
>is not worth noting as a new expression. A revised ed. of a
>textbook--substantial new text, etc.--is worth noting as a new
>expression. Trivial changes should be ignored when deciding whether or
>not something is a new expression or a new manifestation of an existing
>expression. I don't think that deciding what is trivial will be that hard.

>5. The comments made by others about prefaces, illustrations, etc. being
>other works that are package with the "main" work are very helpful. Many of
>the books, movies, songs, etc. that we have in our collections are complex
>objects (made of more than one work.) An introduction to a classic text by
>a noted scholar does not make a new expression of that classic text;

FRBR Listserv Archive

>however, the description we make may well note the introduction and its
>author is a part of the package and include a heading for the author of the
>introduction.

This is where I think we run into problems. I agree with what Matthew wrote, but I'm not sure if everybody else in the FRBR community (are we a community yet?) agrees. Do we really want to create new expressions if the only difference is the presence of illustrations in multiple editions of Humpfry Clinker, Tom Sawyer, Beau Geste, (you insert your favorite literary example) etc. I suppose we could (and VTLS's implementation allows for this) create individual works and expressions for those prefaces, introductions, illustrations, criticisms, etc. (that a cataloger deems important enough) and linked them to an single manifestation. That's what we've done with examples of various "collected works".

In regards to comments about a change in type or font, I think the Final Report is pretty definite that such a change does not make a new Expression.

John L. Espley
VTLS Inc.

Barbara Tillett, 07/05/2003, 14:28

Re: RE: Expressions

I'd like to point out that any application of the model should use the model rather than necessarily being driven by it totally. The work/expression levels could be merged when that makes sense for an application or even merged with manifestation when that makes sense (as it most likely will for the 80% - OCLC's research - of works that appear in only one manifestation). It's the other 20% that are so interesting and important to focus on for FRBR applications where we will derive benefits from collocation and relationship links. It is even a much smaller percentage where we will find it helpful to bring out expression level information based on information derived from the item at hand or readily available reference sources - per current cataloging rules. If we don't have such information, we won't be making the connections, just as now.

FRBR gives us terminology and a model that helps explain the bibliographic universe in a way we feel will be clearer than what we have used in the past and will certainly be helpful to systems designers in the future, especially as we evolve the model into current and future system designers' modelling schemes. - Barbara

Veronica Lencinas, 12/05/2003, 16:40

Re: RE: Expressions

Braille is definitively a different language. I learned that Braille is based on the developments of Luis Braille done in France in 1825. Maybe there are some local adaptations for special characters like our ñ (spanish enye).

Veronica Lencinas
Bibliotecologa
Cordoba, Argentina

Joe Zeeman, 12/05/2003, 17:24

Re: RE: Expressions

No, sorry, Braille is NOT a different language. Braille is a tactile alphabet or writing system for reading and writing an alphabetic language. So English can be written and presented in Braille, as can French. In neither case is a new language involved. Braille does use a lot of contractions to make the reading and writing process more streamlined, but apart from that, it is normal English or French or whatever. A native French-speaker who does not read English could not read an English book in Braille, either.

A google search for Braille gives about 730,000 hits. One of these is:
<http://www.rnib.org.uk/wesupply/fctsheets/braille.htm>

How do the Chinese do Braille-like stuff, I wonder? Back to Google ...

Joe Zeeman

FRBR Listserv Archive

Paul J. Weiss, 12/05/2003, 17:25

Re: RE: Expressions

Actually Braille is definitely not a different language. It is a different way of encoding existing languages, like English. Each letter, number, and punctuation mark is given a set of raised dots in particular positions. Braille and printed English would be analogous to text in Japanese characters and in romanized characters.

Paul J. Weiss
University of California, San Diego
USA

Paul J. Weiss
Head, Monographs Cataloging Division
Catalog Department
UCSD Libraries
858-534-3537
pweiss@ucsd.edu

Allyson Carlyle, 16/05/2003, 17:18

Re: RE: Expressions

I've thought about Braille as an orthographic variant (similar to large print), the kind of which we often care about enough to note in a bibliographic record. The question is, does orthographic variation create a new expression, or a new manifestation?

Those who tie expression to typesetting would be likely to consider that a Braille version triggers a new expression; those who do not would consider it to trigger a new manifestation only. It seems to me that this is an issue that ought to be resolved in our intellectual community before moving on to create applications in which decisions such as this one (does Braille - or orthographic variation in general - indicate new expression or new manifestation) are made ad hoc. If we care about international consistency and sharing of bibliographic information, this is a critical issue - isn't it?

Allyson Carlyle
Associate Dean for Academics
Information School
University of Washington
Box 352840
Seattle, WA 98195
USA

Gerhard Riesthuis, 21/05/2003, 08:00

Re: RE: Expressions

In my opinion a braille edition of a text is not a new expression - Braille is not a language - but only a new manifestation, and as such it should get a new description. The question if the content of the Braille manifestation is the same as of another manifestation is a different question. An expression has in my understanding of the FRBR nothing to do with typesetting. Type (of font) is a characteristic of the manifestation.

Are we not mixing up in this discussion two different questions: 1. When do we have a new expression, and 2. When should we make a new bibliographic record for a new edition?

Dr. Gerhard J.A. Riesthuis [mailto:g.j.a.riesthuis@uva.nl]
Universiteit van Amsterdam
Leerstoelgroep Informatiewetenschap
Oude Turfmarkt 147 1012 GC Amsterdam

FRBR Listserv Archive

Gerhard Riesthuis, 22/05/2003, 07:38

Re: RE: Expressions

Dear Mr. Campbell,

In my opinion the difference between a spoken version of a text and the printed version is greater than when the printed version is changed to a Braille version. In the spoken version the interpretation of the reader/speaker plays a role. In the case of the Braille version there is no re-interpretation of the text by anyone. And as far as I understand FRBR some change in interpretation of the work is needed to have a new interpretation.

I would like to have more opinions on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Gerhard Riesthuis

At 21-05-2003 08:44 -0400, you wrote:

21 May 2003

Dear Mr. Riesthuis:

Consider these lines from page 18 of the Final Report of FRBR:

Inasmuch as the form of expression is an inherent characteristic of the expression, any change in form (e.g., from alpha-numeric notation to spoken word) results in a new expression.

Isn't the change from roman characters to braille merely a change in form, resulting in a new expression? I look forward to reading your reply.

Sincerely,

Bryan Campbell

Middlebury College

bjcampbe@middlebury.edu

Matthew Beacom, 23/05/2003, 08:53

Re: RE: Expressions

If the Braille is set by hand, then I'd think it sound to treat it as if it were a new edition and not a new impression of the same edition since re-setting type by hand necessarily introduces changes to the text. But I am not saying that even in this case the new edition would be a new expression unless one applies the strictest FRBR definition, i.e. any change in the text is a new expression. In this case such a decision to treat the Braille version as a new edition would be sound.

If the Braille version is an output choice from a computer program that controls the typeface, etc. for printing from a master file of the text, then there is no occasion for changes to be introduced to the text and all the versions would simply be manifestations of the one expression.

In a hand set process, orthographic variation between two versions of a text is a sound if not sure proof of separate expressions. In a computer generated process, orthographic variation between two versions of a text is not. The presumption in this case would be that the variation is not an indication of a separate expression. However, how would we know this relationship between a Braille version and an eye readable typeface version? I don't think we'd ever know without studying the corporate archives of the publisher/printer. So it may be a sensible practice to say that orthographic differences that call for the use of different senses (eye vs. hand) should be treated as if they were new expressions. The medium hasn't changed, but the sense one uses to perceive the content has.

If it is simply a change from Times Roman to Garamond in a computer age text, I'd assume it was only a difference of manifestation attributes.

Matthew Beacom

Catalog Librarian for Networked Information Resources

Yale University Library

Allyson Carlyle, 23/05/2003, 08:57

Re: RE: Expressions

Ok, I cannot resist.

FRBR Listserv Archive

It seems to me that there is a huge difference between deliberately creating a new version of a work (e.g., editing, translating, etc.) , and creating a "new" version that has very slight (ok, ok, you literature scholars out there - I know what you will say!) variations in wording, punctuation, capitalization that are caused by human inability to make a perfect transcription of a text every time they set type (that is, new version created by human error).

I would say that publishers who publish unabridged editions of the same original text do not think they are creating a new expression; I would also say that most users would not think that that is what they are doing.

The reason I would like to disregard these variations made by human error/inconsistency is that an important advantage of the FRBR expression level is to group like items in a way we've never been able to group them before; in other words, all versions purporting to be the unabridged version of a text in the original language (or translated into one language by one translator) are treated as the same expression and can be displayed to the user as a group of like things. That is, they represent themselves as the same expression, so let's treat them as the same one and group them together in displays.

If we are to regard a new expression to occur every time a publisher resets a text in a new typesetting, then all of the attributes that signal a new expression are the *same* attributes that signal a new manifestation, making the expression level pointless in these cases.

Allyson

Allyson Carlyle

Associate Dean for Academics

Information School

University of Washington

Box 352840

Seattle, WA 98195

USA

Antony Gordon, 23/05/2003, 14:15

Re: RE: Expressions

I'm very tempted to suggest that any new form that could be generated from some unchanging content by the application of a stylesheet in the way of e.g. XML is clearly a new manifestation. This would apply therefore to print in various sizes and shapes, braille, web and dare I suggest it, even computer-generated speech. In contrast with that last, an audio recording of a human being reading the text will always have subtle and not so subtle differences that make it a new expression. Clearly this approach won't help the early printed book people but then maybe we will need to devise special guidance for them on the treatment of minor textual changes. To come up with a reasonably future-proof approach we're going to have to specify methods that will accommodate earlier materials and their problems without unduly distorting the overall approach. Taking Matthew's example of hand-set braille I think that we should treat that as a new manifestation unless evidence present clearly suggests that expression-level changes have been made. If we treat it as an expression 'just in case', we'll be making the catalogue user's life more difficult than it need be.

In the audio world, similar questions arise. What about mono, stereo, quadraphonic (anyone remember that?), or super-audio versions of the same performance. I'd say that they are all manifestations of the same expression.

Ag

Antony Gordon

Cataloguer/Systems Administrator

British Library Sound Archive

22 Micawber Street

London

N1 7TB UK

Patrick Le Boeuf, 23/05/2003, 14:17

Re: RE: FRBR prototype application

FRBR Listserv Archive

Dear all,

I received the message below yesterday. Roberto Sturman has now subscribed to the FRBR listserv and he allowed me to forward his e-mail to the rest of the list. I am quite sure that all of us will be very excited and eager to have a glimpse at his prototype and to have more information about his experimentation.

Best wishes,
Patrick

Roberto Sturman <Roberto.Sturman@ts.infn.it> le 22/05/2003 11:55:59

Pour : Patrick LE BOEUF/811/DDSR/BnF@BnF

Re: FRBR prototype application

To the Administrator of the IFLA FRBR discussion list

Hello,

My name is Roberto Sturman and I am a librarian employed at the University of Trieste (Italy).

I have developed a computer application in CDS/ISIS (UNESCO free retrieval software) that allows to manage the FRBR model (entities and relationships).

More specifically it comprises two separate modules. The first allows to manage (insert, edit, delete) all the entities and all the relationships defined by the model. This module is based on CDS/ISIS for DOS (ver 3.08) and includes some utilities written by me to manage the data and to simulate the relational environment. It is a text based application.

The second module is a GUI (graphical user interface) based on the Windows version of CDS/ISIS (called WinIisis) that allows only to search and navigate among the entities of the database.

Do you think it can be of any interest?

Best regards,
Roberto Sturman

Matthew Beacom, 23/05/2003, 17:37

Re: RE: Expressions

Allyson,

As I reply to you, I see you wrote only to me. Darn. You made excellent points that would be better seen by the whole group. Please send you comments and mine to the whole group, if you wish.

Anyway, I agree with the point you make that we need to be concerned far more with meaningful changes in the expression of a work than with trivial or accidental changes. The meaningful changes are deliberate ones.

I think we can and should ignore the accidental or trivial changes in manifestations when deciding whether we have a new expression or not. (In general, that is. A particular library or organization may choose to be more exacting for their own purposes.)

I think Braille is special case and was trying to think it through to illuminate the issues. In my comments on Braille, I was just focused on the issue at hand--is a Braille version of a text another expression or a another manifestation. In short, although I think it is another manifestation as the typeface change is just a change in a manifestation attribute, we may be better off treating a Braille version and an eye-readable text version of the same expression as different expressions since the impact on the reader is simply too great to ignore the difference.

What I'd like to see us do is focus our efforts on known meaningful changes such as revised editions, translations, change in the mode of expression, etc. I think what we have to do with FRBR (especially in the AACR community that I am part of) is find ways to use the conceptual model to improve the services we can create for users of our catalogs. The way to do that is to focus on the meaningful differences and highlight the meaningful relationships.

It is a pleasure to "talk" with you about this.

Matthew Beacom

Fernando J. Gómez, 23/05/2003, 17:38

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: RE: FRBR prototype application

Roberto Sturman wrote:

> I have developed a computer application in CDS/ISIS (UNESCO free retrieval
> software) that allows to manage the FRBR model
> (entities and relationships).
> Do you think it can be of any interest?

Well, this is really great news! For those of us who are actively working with CDS/ISIS databases, and, at the same time, are attracted by the perspectives offered by the FRBR bibliographic model, this step is a very significant one. I hope Roberto can share his experience with us.

Best regards,

Fernando

Fernando J. Gómez

Biblioteca Dr. Antonio Monteiro

Instituto de Matemática de Bahía Blanca (CONICET/UNS)

Av. Alem 1253

8000 Bahía Blanca - Argentina

John Attig, 23/05/2003, 18:47

Re: RE: Expressions

At 08:58 AM 5/23/2003, Allyson Carlyle wrote:

>I would say that publishers who publish unabridged editions of the same
>original text do not think they are creating a new expression; I would also
>say that most users would not think that that is what they are doing.

I can't resist either.

We need to remember that neither publishers nor users have any clue what an expression is. Expression is a category created by catalogers in order to group certain entities in a certain way. The concept is an invisible one (I would assume) in that the term is part of the conceptual background in the rules for constructing catalogues, not part of the terminology that we expect to use in the catalogue. The use of the concept is also completely arbitrary; we can define it in any way that makes sense and serves a functional purpose, without worrying about whether our usage matches that of either creators or users of the documents we apply it to.

I tend to agree with the trend of this discussion, that expression should be reserved for major differences in content -- which still leaves us with the task of coming up with an operational definition of "major".

I would also note that there is a similar set of issues with the manifestation entity and that there is a need to define manifestation in terms of major differences in the carrier -- as well as a similar need for an operational definition of "major" in this context as well.

John Attig

Cataloging Services

Penn State University Libraries

jxal6@psulias.psu.edu

Allyson Carlyle, 26/05/2003, 07:34

Re: RE: Expressions

John,

Absolutely and precisely - you are right that we are the only ones who know what an expression is, and (it is clear from the discussion) even we aren't exactly sure. (Although I think publishers *are* using the FRBR model, aren't they?)

What we want out of all of this, I hope, is better catalogs. It would be good if we could be guided by what is the most helpful to catalog users; of course, impossible to determine, as uses and users vary so widely.

The reason that I like expression being reserved for major differences in content is that I think that definition produces a better result for catalog displays (if one uses a more narrow definition, then the distinction between manifestation and expression is very slim, and would, as a consequence, result in little difference then

FRBR Listserv Archive

for displays - why display at expression level when it is almost identical to manifestation level? Why define and make use of expression level at all?)

Allyson

Allyson Carlyle

Associate Dean for Academics

Information School

University of Washington

Box 352840

Seattle, WA 98195

USA

Dan Matei, 26/05/2003, 09:35

Re: RE: Expressions

Dear expressionists

I fully agree with John:

> We need to remember that neither publishers nor users have any clue what an
> expression is. Expression is a category created by catalogers in order to
> group certain entities in a certain way. The concept is an invisible one
> (I would assume) in that the term is part of the conceptual background in
> the rules for constructing catalogues, not part of the terminology that we
> expect to use in the catalogue. The use of the concept is also completely
> arbitrary; we can define it in any way that makes sense and serves a functional
purpose, without worrying about whether our usage matches that
> of either creators or users of the documents we apply it to.

I see no "metaphysical" content for the 'expression'. At most only a very diaphanous one :-)

So, as you say, 'expression' is a pragmatic device (on behalf of our users :-)

> I tend to agree with the trend of this discussion, that expression should
> be reserved for major differences in content -- which still leaves us with
> the task of coming up with an operational definition of "major".

Differences in content ? I assume you mean here "form" or "form of expressing the content".

But, back to the issue, I would consider - for pragmatic reasons !!! -

MAJOR differences between expressing the same text:

A. as:

- a) printed
- b) manuscript
- c) spoken
- d) written in Braille

B. in

- a) English
- b) French
- c) German

.

z) Urdu

In the case of the A "facet" (how to name it ?), the "major" distinction between printed and Braille is made by the "input device" (eye vs. finger). I think even the difference between printed and manuscript is major (from the user point of view): I definitely use such a criterion - as a user - when selecting a material.

For grouping the manifestations of one work I tend to let the user decide which criterion (A vs. B) to use first. Personally I would choose language first, but a blind person will chose the other one, I guess.

What do you think ?

Dan Matei, director

CIMEC - Institute for Cultural Memory

Piata Presei Libere nr. 1, CP 33-90,

Bucharest, Romania

Kerry Kilner, 26/05/2003, 09:36

Re: RE: Expressions

FRBR Listserv Archive

Hello all,

I thought I'd add my bit to this expression / manifestation discussion, which though mostly a lurker on this list, I've been following with interest as it is a frequent decision we make in our daily work.

In the AustLit: Australian Literature Gateway www.austlit.edu.au, which uses the FRBR model as a tool for recording the publication history of texts relating to Australian literature and literary criticism, our operational definition determines that a new expression is created either - as a result of the creator's intervention eg. a revised edition in which the text is altered or added to in a significant way; or a translation from the original language to another; or in some cases, when an editor has had a large influence on the representation of the work - as in the case of a posthumously published scholarly edition. In some cases, particularly relating to children's books, we create a new expression when the work undergoes significant transformation through the addition of illustrations that are integral to the work as a whole. Even though the words of the text may not have changed, the experience of the work will be transformed through the addition of illustrations that work so integrally with the text that they can be perceived jointly as making up a new expression, not simply a new manifestation of an existing story.

Manifestations are the most common form of reproduction of a work and AustLit does not regard reprints, even if in a different format eg. large print, new format, as significantly enough altering the representation of the work to warrant a new expression. We do, however, record the information about the format when relevant in a note. We do not as yet formally record braille reproductions as either a manifestation or an expression in AustLit, but do refer to a work's availability as either a sound recording or a braille edition when we know this information, using a work level note to do so. I would, however, agree with most that the representation of the work as braille does not constitute a new expression, but a new manifestation if it represents the whole text as it appears in other textual representations. Abridged editions are under AustLit's definition new expressions because they significantly alter the work.

One other thing, while users may not have an understanding of the difference between an expression and a manifestation in our terminology, it can, and in my opinion, should be represented through the display of the different "versions" that will indicate that there is a difference between the appearances of the work at various times. In the case of an oft-published work that undergoes various changes, amendments, additions, etc, it's important to clearly and as intuitively as possible, indicate to the end user the correct publication history of the work.

Best wishes,

Kerry Kilner

AustLit : Australian Literature Gateway

Australian Studies Centre

University of Queensland

St Lucia Qld 4072

Gerhard Riesthuis, 26/05/2003, 14:57

Re: RE: Expressions

Dear All,

I still have great difficulties to consider a Braille edition of a given expression as a new expression. That it is "printed" in Braille is a characteristic of the bearer of the expression (i.e. text), in other words of the manifestation. There is a clear distinction between expression and manifestation: the expression is abstract and the manifestation is concrete. In the proposal of Dan Mattei the distinction between expression and manifestation is getting unclear. Who was it who said "Nothing is so practical as a good theory?"

If a braille edition is not only a new manifestation but also a new expression, what about a Serbian-Kroatian text printed in Cyrillic and the same text printed in Roman font? Also two expressions? And what about the same interpretation of the same piece of music on audio cassette and as MP3? I need two different "output" devices to hear the expression. But writing the last sentence I realize that there can be difference in what I hear: the cassette will not sound exactly the same as the cassette. And a recording of a piece of music in a concert hall does not sound exactly as it sounded in

FRBR Listserv Archive

the concerthall. Or is these small differences to be treated the same as printing errors mentioned by Alison?

I still propose to take the notation of interpretation as distinction between different expressions, however vague this distinction may be.

I agree with Alyson that we should not say too easy that we have a new expression!

With my best regards,

Gerhard Riesthuis

Dr. Gerhard J.A. Riesthuis

Leerstoel Boek-, Archief- en Informatiewetenschap

Oude Turfmarkt 147

NL-1012 GC Amsterdam

Vinod Chachra, 27/05/2003, 09:26

Re: RE: Expressions

This is a note in response to Allyson Carlyle's posting.

I cannot resist either. VTLS has implemented the FRBR model in its latest version of ILS. In addition to all the wonderful things that FRBR can do, our users see a great advantage in circulation management as FRBR allows for the possibility of letting users place "holds" on materials at the "work" or "expression" or "manifestation" level. By doing this kind of hold they declare their willingness to "accept", for example, any "manifestation" of a given "expression" - whichever becomes available first.

My point is this - by making too fine a distinction at the "expression" level we dilute the power of this capability for users. I will be happy to elaborate.

Vinod Chachra

Founder and CEO

VTLS Inc.

1701 Kraft Drive

Blacksburg, VA 24060

www.vtls.com

Matthew Beacom, 27/05/2003, 17:32

Re: RE: Expressions

Hi all,

First, I am finding this discussion helpful. I hope others are too. My thoughts on how to operationalize the concept of expression are being developed as I read what you all have to say and try to think through the implications of particular applications of the model. In what follows I may be just talking out loud as I try to understand this.

I think a number of good points have been made about making an operational definition of expression distinguish only among significant or major changes in the content or changes in the mode of expression (e.g from text to sounds). I think it would very often be the case that such significant changes would be indicated by statements of responsibility or statements regarding the edition status or the relation to the original work (e.g. an English translation of Horace's Odes) So I think we'd do best to operationalize the expression concept to highlight the known significant differences in content and ignore lesser and less obvious ones. I think that the two important factors are the significance of the difference in content and the obviousness of that difference. Of course, a difference in the form of expression also makes for different expressions. Here I think the trick is to limit only to differences in the form of expression and not include changes in the format in which that expression is set. In theory that should be easy enough, but in practice I think it will be difficult to resist.

It is clear that expression level attributes of a work are not the only attributes that are vital to a user. Some manifestation attributes are critical with respect to the user's decision on what is most usable to him or her. The Braille and the various digital audio format examples show that such manifestation attributes as type face or format. For example, a DVD of the 1940 academy award winning motion picture "Pride and Prejudice" (with Greer Garson, Laurence Olivier) is of no use to me if I have only a VHS player. But this does not mean that we need to treat format differences as

FRBR Listserv Archive

expression level differences--something that I argued earlier for Braille versions and now seems off the mark to me.

Two other thoughts keep coming back to mind for me. One is the nagging, persistent importance of the physical package to the user. (The physical package could be tangible--a book, a map, a cassette, a DVD or intangible--a TIFF image, and MP3 file, HTML encoded text.) The user needs the right mix of work, expression, manifestation, and item attributes to actually use whatever he or she is seeking. Antony and Vinod seemed to me to point us clearly in this direction.

That leads me to the second recurring thought: the user's needs. However we operationalize these FRBR concepts, we must keep in mind what we are trying to achieve for the users. I think I too often focus on distinctions among the concepts of work, expression, manifestation, and item without clearly linking these concepts to the user's needs. It may be helpful to make such linkages explicit in our discussions together and also in our conversations with other persons who use catalogs but are not catalogers or even librarians.

Well, I must do some work for my employer now.

Matthew Beacom

Catalog Librarian for Networked Information Resources
Yale University Library

William Denton, 02/06/2003, 09:22

Re: Student paper about FRBR

Hello,

I made a few corrections to my essay about FRBR and fundamental cataloguing principles and rules, and put it up at <http://www.miskatonic.org/library/frbr.html>

It's unnerving to announce it to a list full of FRBR experts and experienced librarians, but if you're interested, have a look, remembering it's just a student essay.

I enjoyed reading about FRBR, and I'll try to do more on it while I'm at school. The entities and their relationships, the idea of a work, how a FRBR-aware OPAC could be used--it's all fascinating. I especially enjoyed reading Lubetzky's essays. I look forward to following discussions on the list and seeing how the model and specification evolve.

Cheers,

Bill

William Denton : Toronto, Canada

Liv Aasa Holm, 20/06/2003, 06:49

Re: What is a tower?

Hi all,

I have finally signed up for this interesting discussion list and have tried to catch up with the rest of you.

Thank you, Dan, for sending me the OO-drafts for the model. I agree with Patrick that you should keep the Item as a specialization of Object. Both because it makes a better model (as a model that is, even though most items are not the subject of work(s)) and also because a specific item may be the subject of a work.

I think the model is interesting and I like very much the introduction of Entity and Agent. It makes the picture much more tidy.

Regards

Liv A. Holm

PS. I am off for summer vacation now and will be silent until August.

Liv A. Holm

associate professor

Oslo University college

faculty of journalism, library and information science

Fernando Gómez, 23/06/2003, 09:25

Re: New FRBR display tool from LC

FRBR Listserv Archive

The MARC Standards homepage at LC's web site, shows a new link to a FRBR Display Tool:
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc-functional-analysis/frbrdisplay.html>

I reproduce a few lines from the page:

<quote>

The FRBR Display Tool takes the work done in "Displays for Multiple Versions from MARC 21 and FRBR" one step further. It transforms the bibliographic data found in MARC record files into meaningful displays by grouping the bibliographic data into the "Work," "Expression" and "Manifestation" FRBR concepts. [...] The FRBR Display Tool generates useful hierarchical displays of record sets containing works that consist of multiple expressions and manifestations.

The FRBR Display Tool sorts and arranges bibliographic displays using the FRBR model.

</quote>

Best wishes.

Fernando

Allyson Carlyle, 26/06/2003, 07:35

Re: What is a tower

Hi all,

Is there an OO model for FRBR that anyone would be willing to share? Maybe I missed something on the list. If someone would kindly send it (them?), I would happily receive!

Allyson Carlyle

Associate Dean for Academics

Information School

University of Washington

Box 352840

Seattle, WA 98195

Liv Asa Holm, 07/07/2003, 08:35

Re: What is a tower

Dan Matei has the figures.

Liv A. Holm

Norberto Manzanos, 22/07/2003, 07:28

Re: Presentation

Hi All!

First at all, I beg you apologize me for my poor english. (And for this long long mail)

My name is Norberto Manzanos, I'm a programer and part of a team that has been working in modeling and implementing an object oriented model inspired in FRBR. We work at CAICYT-CONICET in Argentina (A Documental Center from the National Cientific Comision).

We sent an article on that subject to ISKO-Salamanca-2003, but since we couldn't meet the congress for economic reasons, I don't know if the paper will be printed and distributed. I'll be happy to send you this paper when I know clearly what I can do. Unfortunately, this document is in Spanish.

But I can tell you what our point of view is, wich are our coincidences with FRBR, wich our disagreements and our doubts.

Our goal is to model documental objects regarless on the file format. Our approach is fully object oriented. We are not concerned on concepts such as Data Structures, Records, etc. We speak only about objects. We can model abstract concepts or real things, but they are all objects. So, the decision on the persistence of the objects can be posposed. We can use databases, XML or living objects. But this might not affect the model.

The implementation is been written in a pure OO language, Smalltalk. Since we actually have our bibliographical data in ISIS Databases, we are developing a framework to

FRBR Listserv Archive

upload these data from that file format, but other framework for other formats can be created too.

In our first approach we took some ideas from FRBR: Work, Manifestation and Item. We are discussing the Expression level convenience. Until now we consider that entities named expressions in FRBR model could be consider to be works, and the relation between Works and Expression could be supplied by differents relationships between works. Since this relationships could consist on a full gradient of relations, wich could be filtered (or not) with differents degrees of detail by the user or the cataloguer, and differents domains can define this relations according to its needs, we think this could simplify the model without loosing expresivity (or perhaps it win a little).

But all this is under discussion, nothing is definitely. I hope you want to discuss this.

In our first readings of FRBR papers, we found that "Each [of the four levels] is an object derived of the preceding on an inherits properties from it. The most obvious example is (starting from the bottom) the Item. It is common practice that two Items (or copies) of a book, for instance, share all their bibliographic properties and differ only in their physical properties (Barcode number, placement, physical state, etc.)". (Noerr, 2002)

I'm not sure, having read other documents, if this use of inheritance remains the same in FRBR model. (Correct me if this is the case, and do not read the next two paragraphs).

We say: "a document is not an entity that inherits atributes and properties from an abstract work, but the abstract work realize itself in different ways. An Item is not a subclass of a Manifestation; instead an Item "knows" it Manifestation, whereas a Manifestation "knows" its items. We believe that the relation between the three (or four) levels is not inheritance, but composition instead.

The inheritance is consistent if we think in terms of data; in this sense, an Item holds the same data of a Manifestation, plus its own data. But if we think in terms of behaviuor, its clear that an Item does not inherit any behaviour from its Manifestation. Instead, when needed data, the Item can ask the manifestation to give them. This idea could be expanded to Manifestation-Expression and Work-Expression relationships.

Other area of disagreement are the attributes. We expect that the model will hold any thing we call a document. This includes maps, sound recordings, web pages, continuous resources, etc, just like you do. But we believe that the model should be so abstract to support this diversity without introducing particularities from any domain. If we have an attribute for musical key, or cartographic coordinates today, for example, why are we so sure that hundred of new attributes will not be needed tomorrow to hold new kind of documents, for unconsidered domains?

Well, trying to finish this long mail, I want to speak about the responsibility question. I think is correct to distinguish two different objects for Person an Corporate Body. But since both of them can be Authors (or Publishers, or other), wouldn't be more important, form the document point of view, to privilege the funcion rather than the entity? Didn't Person and Corporate Body share enough data and behaviour to be different classes?

We are consider the point of view of INDECS when establishing the entity Action, to solve the responsibility problem. An action is realized by someone, at one moment, in one place.

I you want to, we could discuss this.

I read all the mails of the list before posting this one and I notice you talk about an UML static class definition. Is there a public document for reading this document? Or could you post it to the list?

One question that has been pointed out is the user point of view.

>We may have collections of poems where every single poem needs is own work record and >other collections for which no one ever will request anything but the whole.

Well, I won't. But I'm sure somebody will. There are people making researchs in every single thing.

>Do we really want to create new expressions if the only difference is the presence of >illustrations in multiple editions of Humpfry Clinker, Tom Sawyer

I don't think Mark Twain will be less important that his illustrators in the future, but I can't say the same from other writers. All things must happen. We are all users, aren't we?

FRBR Listserv Archive

And we belong to different level of users. I expect a high detailed description when I'm searching Smalltalk stuff, for example, but I don't need such details in looking for cook books. So we contains a variety of users. Taking the user point of view, is taking OUR point of view as users.

But if the system is small, it can't grow alone, and I can't make it bigger.

If it is big, the only feature I need is to make it smaller (if I want). We don't need simplifications, we need filters.

If I am in secondary school, and I need any exemplar of Don Quijote, well, show me only Works, and I'll take any Item. If I am researching on Cervantes works and its translations, show me all the Works and Expressions (or all Works with the needed related documents). If I am studying the printing of classical spanish works, show me all Manifestations you have (I want any comma differenced). If I want to know the existence and state of Don Quijote's book in the schools of a state, show me all the items (or count them and let me group them with different criteria). An if the system should work in that way, the model might hold all such diveristy.

Cheers. (sorry again for my english).

Norberto Manzanos

CAICYT

www.caicyt.gov.ar

Jacqueline Radebaugh, 24/07/2003, 09:58

Re: FRBR display tool

This message is being posted on multiple discussion lists.

The Network Development and MARC Standards Office at the Library of Congress has recently made a "FRBR Display Tool" available for experimentation (www.loc.gov/marc/frbr/tool.html). The FRBR Display Tool sorts the bibliographic data found in a set of MARC records into hierarchical displays by grouping it using the "Works," "Expressions," and "Manifestations" FRBR concepts. Possible uses for the FRBR Display Tool include experimentation with the collocating and sorting of search result sets into the FRBR categories to test concepts, and applying FRBR to local data to evaluate its consistency for FRBR-type development.

The FRBR Display Tool is downloadable, very flexible and easy to augment according to individual institution's needs.

A Web interface to the FRBR Display Tool is also *coming soon* in which you may input valid sets of MARC records and receive XML and HTML FRBR displays in a web browser. The Web interface will allow you to experiment with FRBR displays without having to download the FRBR Display Tool program onto your computer.

An electronic discussion list has been set up for discussion of experiments and implementations with the FRBR Display Tool. We expect this to be a low volume list focused on this specific tool so we can share changes to the tool that we make with those who are experimenting with it - and you can share local changes and additions that you make, and problems, too. See www.loc.gov/marc/frbr/marcfrbr.html to join!

Please see www.loc.gov/marc/frbr/tool.html for the latest information about the "FRBR Display Tool."

--Jackie Radebaugh

Library of Congress

Network Development & MARC Standards Office

Washington, DC

USA

Patrick Le Boeuf, 25/07/2003, 10:38

Re: Agenda for the Working Group's Meetings in Berlin

Dear all,

Here is my suggested agenda for those who will be able to attend our meetings in Berlin in two weeks:

Monday 4 August 10.45-12.45

Report of activities (P. Le Boeuf)

Info and announcements (P. Le Boeuf)

FRBR Listserv Archive

XOBIS presentation (Dick Miller)

Discussion: What can we learn from XOBIS? Should we express FRBR in XML, and how?

Wednesday 6 August 10.15-12.15

Debates on the following topics:

- What structure for our group? Should we change for a three-level structure with "core members" (any volunteers?) - "observers" (during the IFLA Conferences) - and those who are "just" listserv subscribers?
- Now that FRANAR exists, should we merge both working groups? and how should we call the resulting unique model for authority and bibliographic records (FRBR+FRANAR)? [In my opinion, we should no longer speak about FRBR, but rather promote FRBR+FRANAR as a model that covers a great part of the bibliographic universe]
- Is further theoretical work necessary in order to extend the scope of FRBR+FRANAR (in the field of subject relationships for instance) so that it covers the entire bibliographic universe?
- The WG's planned actions proved unsuccessful: maybe they were too ambitious? Should we drop them, and focus on deliverables instead, or replace them with other, less ambitious actions?
- Deliverables: report and reassessment of the list.

Besides, as I'm leaving tomorrow for Frankfurt before I go to Berlin and the listserv is not automated, all messages you may post from tonight on will have to wait until I'm back (on August 11th) in order to be circulated. Please excuse me for that inconvenience - but may that not prevent you from posting messages if you wish! I'll circulate them anyhow as soon as I'm back.

Best wishes,
Patrick

Lorcan Dempsey, 11/08/2003, 09:56

Re: Agenda for the Working Group's Meetings in Berlin

Jay Jordan, OCLC CEO and President, announced at IFLA in Berlin today that we are publishing the OCLC Research FRBR work-set algorithm.

Colleagues may find it at:

<http://www.oclc.org/research/software/frbr/>

Regards, Lorcan

Lorcan Dempsey, VP, Research, OCLC

<http://www.oclc.org/research/staff/dempsey/>

Martha Yee, 11/08/2003, 10:08

Re: Error in FRBR itself?

I sent this last week to the MARCFRBR list but there has not been much discussion yet, so thought I would copy this list, as well...

Let me know what you think...

Martha

-----Original Message-----

From: Martha Yee [mailto:myee@ucla.edu]

Sent: Friday, August 01, 2003 11:26 AM

To: MARCFRBRPOS

Subject: FW: Error in FRBR itself?

I believe that the searching, sorting and display specifications for the FRBR display tool may be flawed due to a flaw in FRBR itself (but would like to know what others think). I have always thought that the manifestation and expression tables in FRBR did not follow the definitions of manifestation and expression in 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. The listing of all of the fields of the bibliographic record at the manifestation level in the FRBR display tool specs would seem to bear me out. The following fields belong in the FRBR expression table and at the expression level in the FRBR display tool specs:

FRBR Listserv Archive

Edition: 250 \$a \$b [as when there is an accurate edition statement on the item, such as 2nd rev. ed.]

Title: \$a \$b \$n \$p [as when the title of an expression is different from the titles of other expressions of the work]

Statement of responsibility: 245 \$c [as when a statement of subsidiary authorship such as the name of a translator or illustrator is different on different expressions of the work]

Physical description [as when the extent differs between expressions of a work; 115 min. for the original release version of a film vs. 130 min. for the director's cut, for example; or as when an illustration statement is the only clue to the fact that one expression is illustrated and another is not]

If these were included at the manifestation level in FRBR because of the situation that arises when there is variation in packaging but not variation in the underlying intellectual content, then these fields should be included in BOTH the expression level table AND the manifestation level table! It has been my experience, though, that statements from the publisher such as '2nd rev. ed.' or 'translated by Joseph Jones,' and statements from a cataloger such as '130 min.,' or 'ill.' and the like are almost always accurate and almost always connected with expression change not manifestation change.

Note that the fact that variation in packaging can lead to some "false" edition statements argues for avoiding any kind of automated processing below the work level; human editing is much more likely to be accurate than brute machine processing in the sorting out of expressions and manifestations. [I can't resist pointing out that the sorting at the work level functions to the degree that it does largely because human catalogers have built collocation mechanisms such as uniform titles into the records!] According to the FRBR definition of manifestation at 3.2.3, the only things that would belong at the manifestation level would be carrier description and distribution information, e.g.

some GMD changes, such as videorecording vs. motion picture, signalling a mere change in carrier

some SMD changes, such as audiocassette vs. CD, signalling a mere change in carrier changes in the name of the distributor unassociated with a change in the underlying content

Let me know what you all think...

Martha

Martha M. Yee

Cataloging Supervisor

UCLA Film and Television Archive

1015 N. Cahuenga Blvd.

Los Angeles, California 90038

Martha Yee, 11/08/2003, 10:09

Re: Follow-up in expression and manifestation

I thought it might help make my case about the discrepancy between FRBR definitions of expression and manifestation in section 3.2 and the FRBR tables for expression and manifestation if I reminded you that one of the examples on p. 17 in the FRBR document (3.2.1) is that of Henry Gray's Anatomy of the human body, with the first, second and third editions identified as different expressions of the work. This is an example in which the expression identification occurs in the date (on the first edition) and in the edition statement in the 250 field and statements of subsidiary responsibility (illustration statements and later editors) on subsequent expressions...

Martha

Martha M. Yee

Cataloging Supervisor

UCLA Film and Television Archive

1015 N. Cahuenga Blvd.

Los Angeles, CA 90038-2635

Barbara B. Tillett, 12/08/2003, 10:11

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: Expression and manifestation follow-up

Right, we get the clues and evidence of expressions and works from the statements found in manifestations (and even sometimes from reference sources). I still don't see the discrepancy with FRBR's definitions and tables. - Barbara Tillett

Barbara B. Tillett, 12/08/2003, 10:14

Re: Error in FRBR itself?

FRBR is not in error on this. I find FRBR is actually very clear on this, and the "statements" as found on manifestations (i.e., areas of ISBD - title, statements of responsibility, edition statements, etc.) are attributes of the manifestation. Those statements may give clues about the expression and the work, but they are not attributes of the expression or work. They may be the source for how we "name" the expression or work, but it is the "name" that is the attribute, not the statement found on the manifestation.

Our bibliographic records are in general for manifestations (as confirmed by the European rule makers and cataloguing experts at their IFLA sponsored meeting in Frankfurt, July 28-30). We provide uniform title access points sometimes in those bibliographic records that identify the work or expression. The rule makers also felt that works and expressions should be identified through authority records. We establish the "name" or uniform title for the expression or work based on cataloguing codes using clues from information found on manifestations or sometimes from references sources.

Certainly information in the bibliographic record can be used for collocating at the expression level, such as has been done with the VTLIS Virtua prototype. However, this is manipulating our existing records to see how we can use what we have to accomplish the FRBR user tasks and the collocating function of the catalog. It does not mean that those "fields" or "statements" are really attributes of the expression.

You may be interested to know that the IFLA Cataloguing Section's FRBR Review Group will be addressing the practical application of FRBR to cataloguing activities, which should also help people better understand how the FRBR conceptual model may translate into cataloguing and bibliographic records. That working group is planned to get started in the next few months. - Barbara Tillett

Martha Yee, 13/08/2003, 10:00

Re: Definitions vs. tables in FRBR

Unfortunately, the fact remains that according to FRBR, any change in the intellectual or artistic content of the work creates a new expression (or sometimes a new work), yet the elements included in the expression table are insufficient to identify all significant changes in intellectual and artistic content, while most of the elements included in the manifestation table are more likely to identify a change in expression than a change in manifestation.

I fear that repeating all of the elements of the bibliographic record in an expression-based uniform title is going to prove to be a very cumbersome solution to this problem!

In my opinion, we need professional catalogers (i.e., educated and experienced catalogers) to identify those parts of the bibliographic description that indicate mere change in carrier or distribution information (i.e., manifestation change), and those parts that indicate change in expression or even work. Which elements these are will vary from one work to the next and may change over time. Machines will not be able to do this, and people who have not been educated in the principles of cataloging (or who have not discerned them on their own), no matter how smart they are, will not be able to do this...

If we cannot figure out a way to do this in a cost-efficient manner, we will continue to make a mess of work displays in our OPACs and provide ammunition for those who think Google is just as good as a catalog. Sorry to be so grim!

Martha

FRBR Listserv Archive

Barbara B. Tillett, 12/08/2003, 10:02
Re: Definitions vs. tables in FRBR

Please see my comments inserted below as "BT:" after each of Martha's comments. -
Barbara Tillett

>>> myee@UCLA.EDU 08/12/03 10:14AM >>>

Unfortunately, the fact remains that according to FRBR, any change in the intellectual or artistic content of the work creates a new expression (or sometimes a new work), yet the elements included in the expression table are insufficient to identify all significant changes in intellectual and artistic content, while most of the elements included in the manifestation table are more likely to identify a change in expression than a change in manifestation.

BT: Where one gets the information to identify an expression is not the same as the "attributes" used to identify that entity. The table lists attributes, not sources to find changes that indicate a new expression - you are reading too much into it. The cataloguing rules would provide guidance on what elements to use to create the uniform titles that identify expressions and where to find such information- not the FRBR table.

I fear that repeating all of the elements of the bibliographic record in an expression-based uniform title is going to prove to be a very cumbersome solution to this problem!

BT: That's exactly what will NOT be done and why the attributes for an expression are few. We would certainly not want to repeat the bib record description as a uniform title (or "future" citation for the expression). I must be missing something earlier that you must be reacting to, as it is certainly not the FRBR report that would suggest what you are stating.

In my opinion, we need professional catalogers (i.e., educated and experienced catalogers) to identify those parts of the bibliographic description that indicate mere change in carrier or distribution information (i.e., manifestation change), and those parts that indicate change in expression or even work. Which elements these are will vary from one work to the next and may change over time. Machines will not be able to do this, and people who have not been educated in the principles of cataloging (or who have not discerned them on their own), no matter how smart they are, will not be able to do this...

BT: I'm not sure what brought on your comments. There are certainly things machines can help a cataloger sort out, and we'd want all the help we can get, but I completely agree that we still need cataloguing rules and catalogers.

If we cannot figure out a way to do this in a cost-efficient manner, we will continue to make a mess of work displays in our OPACs and provide ammunition for those who think Google is just as good as a catalog. Sorry to be so grim!

BT: Looking for ways to do cataloguing in a more cost-effective manner has always been a focus of catalogers (as you well know, since libraries began, and particularly noticed in Panizzi's debates with the British Museum). As I mentioned in an earlier email, I think the FRBR Working Group that will look at guidelines for applying FRBR to cataloguing will be addressing these issues.

Dan Matei, 13/08/2003, 10:44
Re: Definitions vs. tables in FRBR

In my opinion, we need professional catalogers (i.e., educated and experienced catalogers) to identify those parts of the bibliographic description that indicate mere change in carrier or distribution information (i.e., manifestation change), and those parts that indicate change in expression or even work. Which elements these are will vary from one work to the next and may change over time. Machines will not be able to do this, and people who have not been educated in the principles of cataloging (or who have not discerned them on their own), no matter how smart they are, will not be able to do this...

BT: I'm not sure what brought on your comments. There are certainly things machines can help a cataloger sort out, and we'd want all the help we can get, but I completely agree that we still need cataloguing rules and catalogers.

I would add: we still need 'human judgment'.

FRBR Listserv Archive

[In this context, by "judgment" I mean "a flexible use of criteria and rules", i.e. in some instances rule 1 prevail, in others rule 2 and so on. To put it bluntly: not a mechanical algorithm.]

And this can preserve a bit of charm in the cataloguing business :-)

On the other hand, let's suppose a cataloguer misjudges a manifestation:

a) [by error] she "detects" a new expression. What happens ? An "impostor" expression record is born. How big is the trouble ?

b) [by error] she does not "detect" the new expression in the manifestation "in hand". What happens ? A legitimate expression record fails to emerge. How big is the trouble ?

I guess, in both cases the error is discovered by the next cataloguer who happens to have "in hand" the manifestation in question. Or maybe not so quickly :-)

Of course, there will be differences of opinions among cataloguers about the "right to existence" of an expression. But, I guess/hope that in the worst case some manifestations will be "abusively" collocated, and other will be deprived by their "right to collocation" (which is currently the case for most of the manifestations, anyway). So, not quite a disaster.

Dan Matei

Dick Miller, 16/08/2003, 08:49

Re: Danke, Merci, Tack, Thanx ...

Please accept my sincere thanks for the opportunity to present an overview of XOBIS to the Group. The presentation is now available on our project website: <http://medlane.stanford.edu> under "Selected Publications."

The one area I should have stressed more is that many decisions regarding the structure of XOBIS were intended to support improved interfacing and indexing, e.g. finding authors for a particular time period, providing hierarchical access to organizational structure (past and present), hierarchical time access to publication date, resources about a period, events held/occurring during a period, etc., etc.

Should any questions arise, don't hesitate to contact me. I plan to study FRBR and the CRM more extensively.

Regards, Dick

Dick R. Miller

Head of Technical Services & Systems Librarian

Lane Medical Library, L109

Stanford University Medical Center

Stanford, CA 94305-5123

Patrick Le Boeuf, 26/08/2003, 11:38

Re: Interpretation of the "Work" notion

Dear all,

At John Byrum's request, I forward to the listserv a question that has been posed to him by Göran Berntsson. This question echoes some discussions I had this summer in Frankfurt with Isa de Pinedo, and illustrates the fact, stressed in Berlin by Edward O'Neill and reflected in our new Strategic Plan, that we need to resolve "conflicting operational definitions and application of the FRBR model" and to clarify some of these definitions.

Of course all of you are welcome to answer Mr. Berntsson; I just would like to start the discussion with a statement that the FRBR definition of "Work" such as it stands today may be a bit misleading: "a distinct intellectual or artistic creation". Actually, the FRBR concept of "Work" does not exactly cover the "traditional" notion of "a work" such as we are used to thinking it in our cultural history. It does cover that notion, of course, but it expands it as well. FRBR does not aim to model intellectual artifacts per se nor the process of intellectual creation per se; FRBR models the entities that are relevant to cataloguing practice, and that may not necessarily be relevant to literary criticism; and the initial goal of FRBR was not to revolutionize cataloguing (though many of us think it does have that potential), but to account for it. And in cataloguing practice, we often tend to "sum up" the general content of a publication, at the highest possible level. This is notably the case in

FRBR Listserv Archive

sound recordings cataloguing -- hence so many such vague uniform titles as "Piano music. Selections". This is the overall indication of the main content of a publication, something that the much debated notion of "main entry" strives to capture. In the case of music cataloguing, uniform titles may capture either the notion of "a work" in the traditional, intellectual sense of a complete artifact in the form its creator created it, or the overall notion of what a given publication contains. And there is a whole/part relationship between these two notions: each single piano sonata can be regarded as a part of the overall "Piano music" of a given composer. Besides, in musical tradition, we tend to see homogeneous collections of works of one author belonging to the same form/genre as a "kind" of work on its own. In that sense, Bach's Six suites for unaccompanied cello have a whole/part relationship to Bach's Suite #1 for unaccompanied cello (cf. also, in the field of theological literature, Richard Smiraglia's development on the artificial construction by tradition of such "works" as Bridget of Sweden's Revelations; actually, the "crystallizing" of 'a work' depends very much on "manifestations").

To sum up, there are at least four kinds of musical "works" in FRBR, some of which may not correspond to what we are used to regarding as actual instances of "works":

- 1) "a distinct intellectual or artistic creation", such as a Schubert song or a symphonic poem by Richard Strauss,
- 2) a composite work comprising several parts, but that still is regarded as "a distinct intellectual or artistic creation", such as Beethoven's 5th symphony (4 movements), or Schubert's Unfinished symphony (2 movements instead of the 4 expected), or Mozart's Piano sonata No. 15 (which actually consists of two distinct works, namely Allegro & Andante KV 533 and Rondo KV 494, which results in the sonata not having Köchel number as a whole), or Wagner's Ring des Nibelungen that comprises 4 distinct operas (the last three of which comprise three acts; each opera is regarded as a distinct work, but of course not each act of each opera), or Messiaen's "Livre d'orgue" or "Catalogue d'oiseaux" (a collection of organ pieces and a collection of piano pieces; each piece is also individually regarded as a complete work),
- 3) a collection of works belonging to the same form/genre, eventually regarded by tradition as a kind of "mega-work", such as Bach's Brandenburg concertos, Chopin's Nocturnes, or Skryabin's Preludes,
- 4) the overall, (more or less) arbitrary content of a collection designed by a publisher and/or editor, such as "The 12 most beautiful adagios ever", "Wonderful Christmas carols" or "Ride of the Valkyries and other powerful classics" (this tradition of creating "new" musical works by accumulating extant ones in a given "manifestation" is very old and can be traced back to the Middle Ages: polyphonic masses were "created" in manuscripts by pulling together polyphonic mass movements that had not been originally composed to that purpose).

But I expect my views to be regarded, perhaps, as a bit controversial; please post your own comments.

Best wishes,
Patrick

Patrick:

I am thinking that it would be best if you introduced Mr. Berntsson to the FRBR discussion list, where it could post such queries as that which is attached. Do you agree?

Best wishes, John

John D. Byrum, Jr.
Chief, Regional & Cooperative Cataloging
Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540-4380
USA

Received: from sun8.loc.gov by loc.gov; Mon, 25 Aug 2003 03:39:28 -0400
Date: Mon, 25 Aug 2003 09:39:43 +0200
From: "=?ISO-8859-1?Q?G=F6ran=20Berntsson?=" <Goran.Berntsson@hb.se>
To: <jbyr@loc.gov>

FRBR Listserv Archive

Subject: FRBR

Sir,

Once before I have dared to put a question directly to you and succeeded in having a kind an informative answer.

Here follows my trial no 2!

In Saur's edition (1998) of FRBR, p. 21, is found an example illustrating "manifestations" of a work. The work concerned is Bach's Six suites for unaccompanied cello and the two manifestations are Janos Starker's and Yo-Yo Ma's recordings.

Question:

I should say Bach's Six suites ... are *six* works and that e.g. "Suite no 1" would have functioned better as an example.

In what way am I wrong?

Best regards
Göran Berntsson

Paulo Leitão, 01/09/2003, 09:45

Re: Interpretation of the "Work" notion

Dear all,

Regarding the question posted by Patrick, I will expose some other concerns in the field of electronic resources:

1- In electronic resources, mainly web sites, what is a work? All the web site? A distinct part of the site? Of course, this depends on the nature of the content, but considering the relations between the pieces of information in a structured web site, all the site can be considered a work?

2- Considering the changes in content, when can the same web site (same URI) be considered a new work?

The notion of super work introduced, for example, by Svenonius is interesting in this context, because we can collocate all the "versions" of the site. However this will not solve completely my two questions.

Any comments?

Thanks

Paulo Leitão

Alan Danskin, 01/09/2003, 18:20

Re: Interpretation of the "Work" notion

Dear all,

1. There are many resources (not just electronic) which are aggregations of works. This is a point that Patrick has also raised. Here are a few thoughts...

The level at which these resources are catalogued is determined by the interests and priorities of the cataloguing agency. For example, a poetry library may wish to create a work record for each poem within an anthology, whereas a national bibliographic agency may be content (or constrained by resourcing) to create a single work record that describes the anthology. I think that describing the relationships between works rather than defining different kinds of works is a more flexible approach and it will make sharing records easier. If both the poetry library and the national bibliographic agency regard the anthology as a work, they are able to share the work record. The poetry library benefits from the work of the NBA in creating the anthology record and can add links relating it to the other work records it creates, . The NBA could in turn choose to import the additional work records created by the poetry library, thus creating a symbiotic relationship, which would ultimately benefit patrons. However if the institutions regard the "poems" and the "anthology" as different entities I don't think this cooperative model will work, as the NBA is likely to think of the anthology as a "work" whereas the poetry library would think of it as a "superwork".

Alan

FRBR Listserv Archive

Cataloguing Data Coordinator, Scholarship & Collections, The British Library, Boston Spa, Wetherby, West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

Jian Qin, 02/09/2003, 08:58

Re: Interpretation of the "Work" notion

It is interesting to see the two notions used in parallel in representing information objects. One notion is "work" used in FRBR, and the other "resource" used in metadata and RDF schema language. It seems to me that the notion of work represents a more rigid sense of information objects as an intellectual property, ownership, and can be housed in a library, and be touched, played, and seen directly or through some application medium.

On the other hand, the notion of resource is more loosely defined compared to the notion of work, which is especially true in RDF schema. Resource in metadata and RDF schema may represent an event, a thing, a person, or an organization, or a fact--they don't have to be some sort of publications (including performance).

That said, it becomes apparent that the notion of work (so the FRBR model) may not be a one-size-for-all type of model. Metadata for digital resources is becoming an independent area with some overlaps with library cataloging. Should library catalogs cover web-based resources or vice versa? The FRBR model obviously tried to achieve the convergence but in the absence of web technology such as RDF schema. If we want to apply the model to web-based resources, then we may need to reconsider the notion of work. If FRBR is moving towards the direction of using RDF schema as encoding language in its implementation model, then perhaps resource is a more appropriate notion.

Regards,

Jian Qin, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, School of Information Studies, Syracuse University

Liv Holm, 18/09/2003, 17:49

Re: Editions

Dear colleagues

We (my colleague, our students and I) have been reading several of the articles referenced in the FRBR bibliography and we are at present busy with splitting existing MARC records on Works, Expressions and Manifestations.

During this we have of course met problems.

One is:

An attribute for Expression is "Other distinguishing characteristics" which includes "edition".

An attribute for Manifestation is "edition"

In some of the conversion tables I have seen, the content of field "250 a" is placed in the Manifestation. Even though the content may be "Abridged version" or "10. edition" etc.

Is not a new edition a new Expression?

If the "new" edition is identical to the previous one is it then called a new "edition"?

My question is: is the attribute "edition" really an attribute on the manifestation level, given the definition of expression.

Liv A. Holm

associate professor

Oslo University college

faculty of journalism, library and information science

Ketil Albertsen, 19/09/2003, 11:59

Re: Editions

Liv A. Holm wrote:

> An attribute for Expression is "Other distinguishing characteristics" which
> includes "edition".

> An attribute for Manifestation is "edition"

FRBR Listserv Archive

> In some of the conversion tables I have seen, the content of field "250 a"
> is placed in the Manifestation. Even though the content may be "Abridged
> version" or "10. edition" etc.
> Is not a new edition a new Expression?
> If the "new" edition is identical to the previous one is it then called a
> new "edition"?
> My question is: is the attribute "edition" really an attribute on the
> manifestation level, given the definition of expression.

Disclaimer: I am a computer guy, not a librarian.

My librarian colleagues tell me that the term "edition" (or, in Norwegian: utgave) is a quite broad term, covering both what I as an engineer would call "version" (i.e. a chronological successor) and a "variant" (an alternative, usually existing in parallel with other variants).

So, "the hardbound edition" and "the paperback edition" would, in computer terminology, be different *variants*.

"The second edition" and "the third edition" would be *versions*.

In the "version" sense, another edition is a new expression, but in the "variant" sense, when the intellectual contents is the same for the variants, they are the same expression, but different manifestations.

Different language editions (or language versions, to use computer terminology) have different intellectual contents, so they are different expressions.

To confuse it even further: "The September edition" and "The October edition" have *completely* different contents, at least in some cases - it might be better to consider them distinct *works*, as long as we have nothing better for them.

The definition of the term "edition" is rather fuzzy, so in our project we have explicitly declared it as a term *not* to be used; we use the more well-defined terms "version" and "variant".

Sidetracking a little:

Our project manages network accessible documents, web pages and the like. Web pages may be composed of several components, updated individually, so web page versions will often appear similar to integrating continuing resources.

On the other hand: "Blogs" are more like traditional serials, i.e. successively issued continuing resources, although the new material is usually added to the same physical unit (file) as the existing one, and the formal requirements (e.g. dating or numbering of the increments etc.) are rarely satisfied.

As of yet, FRBR is fully developed (eeeh, well... Let's say that it is *more* fully developed) for monographs only; the tools for handling any kind of aggregate are very weak. There is activity on the way to develop the model further to satisfy the needs for continuing resources, and I hope that we will see general modelling mechanisms for handling all sorts of aggregates - both integrating and successively issued continuing resources, for handling the entire dynamic lifetime of a network entity such as a web newspaper which is being updated continuously, and for representing more complex object relationships e.g. for audiovisual productions.

(re. the latter: The "Echo" project - a report is available at <http://pc-erato2.iei.pi.cnr.it/echo/documents/> - have extended FRBR with aggregation concepts for handling relations between sound, image, script and other entities of importance for handling film/video - this is interesting reading!).

My guess is that the next major step in the development of the FRBR model will have to do with aggregation concepts.

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials" - The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

Gunilla Jonsson, 19/09/2003, 12:10

Re: Editions

Yes, according to the definition of edition as established and used over decades within the field of textual criticism, and also in the ISO standard for bibliographical terminology, it does pertain to the manifestation level. An abridged or revised edition, however, necessarily implies a new expression, whereas just a "new

FRBR Listserv Archive

edition" theoretically might represent exactly the same expression as the previous edition. In practice, a new edition almost always contains small, unintended or intended (spelling corrections, e.g.) divergencies, although these changes are very seldom detected in the process of cataloguing. If we shall follow the FRBR definition of manifestation strictly, only "a state of an edition" would be an appropriate attribute to manifestation. FRBR does not recommend that it is followed that strictly in normal library work, however. There is much more to say on this issue, but I will come back with a more comprehensive investigation into these issues in a couple of weeks.

For the time being, the definition of edition from ISO 5127, 1983, Documentation and information - Vocabulary: "edition Whole set of copies of a document printed from one type-setting or produced from a single copy used as master copy, and published by a publisher or group of publishers. Notes. 1. An edition may include several impressions in which small changes are made. -- That is, it is the act of registration that defines the edition. This ISO standard was issued in a revised edition in 2002, and there, unfortunately, this definition has been changed to something much vaguer. The 1983 "expression" is the only one which is valid from the point of view of textual criticism.

Gunilla Jonsson

Liv Aasa Holm, 19/09/2003, 12:13

Re: Editions

Thanks to Gunilla.

Then information such as 9. and 10. edition should have been 9. and 10. impressions (opplag in Norwegian).

An English edition, a German edition, a French edition are clearly different expressions. An abridged edition is also a new expression.

Again we have to clarify the expression level.

And another thing: How much harm will it do if we treat all editions as different expressions? (This is how the FRBR can be read).

How can we verify that a novel published in two different series are the same expression (if the same national language)? In one series they may have modernised the language to some extent without stating this anywhere.

In most textbooks a new edition means changes to the content. And it does not say anywhere (except in the preface) that the content has been modified/rearranged etc. The bibliographic record does not contain any information about this. But those two editions are clearly two different expressions. The changes may not be big enough to say they are two different works. And in any case that would give a poorer database if we treated them like that.

Is it not better to establish clear rules such as:

new edition results in a new expression. Always.

new impression (opplag) means the same expression AND the same manifestation

How would these rules influence the searching and presentation? Would it be more difficult to present the search results to the users? Maybe, but I think not.

Would it be confusing for the users? I do not think so.

Would it be contrary to established routines? Maybe, but FRBR causes already changes to routines.

Would it be easier to convert existing records, AND to enter new records?

Yes, definitely.

Liv A. Holm

Liv Aasa Holm, 19/09/2003, 13:25

Re: Editions

Thanks to Ketil also for comments.

Like Ketil I must confess I am a computer person, not a cataloguer/librarian.

In our seminar (FRBR for master students) we are trying to distribute MARC data to Works, Expressions and manifestations. And we have only retrieved records for paper documents. We are not doing any type of automatic datamining. The aim of this test is to get a better understanding of the model itself and the problems of "using" it. Even

FRBR Listserv Archive

so, we have come across problems of the type: "where should this element be placed". Again, of course it is the Expression level that causes the difficulties. "Edition" is just one of them.

I wonder if the following is always the case (limiting to printed material).

- Non-fiction material: a new edition is always a new expression.
- Fiction material: sometimes it is a new expression, sometimes not

The play A doll's house is ONE work, but we may have several expressions in Norwegian:

- the original language
- a modernised language
- a school edition
- etc.

On the other hand: The complete works of Henrik Ibsen have been published as:

- ...
- 7th. edition
- 8th. edition
- 9th. edition
- etc.

And in one instance (12th. edition) it says that that edition is exactly like 10th. edition (but NOT exactly like the 11th. edition).

So is 10. and 12. editions two manifestations of the same expression, while 11. is another expression?

This really will make it hard to make a conversion program, but also hard to use a "FRBR-structured" system.

Again, why not make a new (and better) definition of what we mean by EDITION, and then specify clear rules for how to treat them. What would we lose?

As for when "something" is a new WORK. Small changes and updates, e.g. more stuff about object-oriented systems in a textbook about database theory should not be regarded as a new work in my opinion. If so, we would need some many relationships in the system to be sure to link the relevant "works", the application programs would be much more complex. Besides, as long as the authors view a new edition as just that, it is not a new work.

Liv A. Holm

Martin Doerr, 19/09/2003, 14:07

Re: Editions

Dear Liv,

I actually think, that you cannot apply content based definitions like "Expression" to functionally defined terms like "Edition".

Following your example below, I would argue that 10. and 12. "edition" is equivalent to Manifestations of the same expression as you say.

The others seem to be based on different expressions. That is however no argument, that they are NOT a Manifestation as well. I think that "Edition" is always a special case (IsA) of Manifestation. Multiple editions may be based on multiple Expressions of the same Work or on the same Expression.

The question of "new" work is very interesting. It seems not very helpful to have a strict distinction. I guess Work must have parts and derivatives. Then some views interpreting something as one Work can be matched against others with more detailed break-up into pieces.

Martin

Gunilla Jonsson, 19/09/2003, 14:19

Re: Editions

Just a quick reply. Please see comments inserted below.

Best, Gunilla

Liv Aasa Holm wrote:

>Thanks to Gunilla.

>Then information such as 9. and 10. edition should have been 9. and 10.

FRBR Listserv Archive

>impressions (opplag in Norwegian).

GJ: Yes, most probably. But be cautious! Publishers label things impression or edition as it fits their marketing interests. In the first International Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (IME ICC) this summer, we stated as a fact that cataloguers can only decide the expression by the evidence on the manifestation.

>An English edition, a German edition, a French edition are clearly different expressions. An abridged edition is also a new expression.

>Again we have to clarify the expression level.

>And another thing: How much harm will it do if we treat all editions as different expressions? (This is how the FRBR can be read).

GJ: Yes, but not what it is aiming at, I believe.

>How can we verify that a novel published in two different series are the same expression (if the same national language)? In one series they may have modernised the language to some extent without stating this anywhere.

GJ: That is exactly what we cannot afford to verify in most cases in the library work.

>In most textbooks a new edition means changes to the content. And it does not say anywhere (except in the preface) that the content has been

>modified/rearranged etc. The bibliographic record does not contain any

>information about this. But those two editions are clearly two different

>expressions. The changes may not be big enough to say they are two

>different works. And in any case that would give a poorer database if we

>treated them like that.

>Is it not better to establish clear rules such as:

>new edition results in a new expression. Always.

GJ: It is a clear rule (always an advantage), but wouldn't it require some organizational sublevel in the presentation interface anyway? I mean, wouldn't you wish to collocate all editions (that do not announce themselves as abridged or adapted, etc.) of a translation of work A by XX under one expression heading, and all editions of a translation of work A by XY under another one?

>new impression (opplag) means the same expression AND the same manifestation

GJ: Sure.

>How would these rules influence the searching and presentation? Would it be

>more difficult to present the search results to the users? Maybe, but I

>think not.

GJ: See comment above. You get expressions of expressions so to speak. But would you really wish to have separate expression records (whatever such a record will be -- not yet quite clear!) for all these expressions?

>Would it be confusing for the users? I do not think so.

>Would it be contrary to established routines? Maybe, but FRBR causes already

>changes to routines.

GJ: That depends on what you envisage as the reply for my question above about collocation.

Göran Berntsson, 19/09/2003, 14:41

Re: Editions

Just one short remark:

Liv A. Holm wrote: - Non-fiction material: a new edition is always a new expression.

What ever **we** decide, the publishers use and have (long enough) used the term "edition" (in different languages) according to their own preferences. As a publisher you may prefer to write "new edition" instead of "new printing". Why? To make people **buy** of course! So, even if you just change some misprints or in fact don't change anything at all, you might as well use the term "new edition" instead of "new printing". Especially if you think of textbooks for students. Very important to read the "latest edition", isn't it? If we decide that new editions of non-fiction are new expressions, does it **work** (sorry)?

Liv A. Holm wrote: - Fiction material: sometimes it is a new expression, sometimes not. Same problem here. If you take an old Swedish novel you may read on the titlepage "Tredje upplagan" (= 3. ed.) but it is totally obvious that it is absolutely nothing but the third printing of the same expression.

What shall guide our judgement of manifestation or expression? The very content of the document or the publisher's way of putting it?

FRBR Listserv Archive

Best wishes
Göran Berntsson

Gunilla Jonsson, 19/09/2003, 14:58
Re: Editions

Oh, oh, I don't have time to expand on this at this moment, but I refer again to a more comprehensive communication that I'm working on. Please, just see one comment below!
Gunilla

*>Again, why not make a new (and better) definition of what we mean by
>EDITION, and then specify clear rules for how to treat them. What would we
>loose?*

GJ: Stop! leave the definition of edition alone! The one I quoted in my first mail is long since established, and works well for its purposes, because it actually pins down a decisive act (that of registration for mass production) in the history of a text. "Edition" is also used by the publishing business in a number of varying and sometimes intentionally vague meanings. We will not change their use, and librarians will not be able to identify which of the editions, that are so announced by a publisher, that fit the library definition, no matter how good it is. (That is of course the case even with the existing definition.) The fact is that there is nothing in FRBR that maps to edition, and I think we have to accept that.

Liv Aasa Holm, 19/09/2003, 15:04
Re: Editions

Thanks again to Gunilla and to Martin. I am very glad for all comments. They do help me to understand some of the problems here and to make my own view more firm. You know, I would prefer (as a user) to see different editions (even 1. and 12. as in the example) as separate entries in a search result as long as they are grouped under the same Work. Since we can not know whether they are different or equal I would like them to be separate entries in the display of the search result (and with the manifestation as another level of display). This because the DATE of the edition is important in many cases. Sometimes you can be sure what the first edition will look like, but not be sure of anything in the 10. It may be exactly like the first, or it may be radically different. Without this being stated anywhere.

And of course no library will have resources to compare all new manifestations with earlier ones to see if they really belong to a new expression or not.

I am aware of the problems with publishers calling it a new edition even if it is only a new manifestation (marketing purpose or ignorance). But I think we may give poorer service to our users if we miss out on an expression compared to making an expression too many.

Will this require more complicated application programs. No, I do not think so since we do have all four levels already to be displayed. The big problem in displaying result sets is (as we discussed at ELAG) "what is actually a result set" from a search in a FRBR-modeled system. But that problem is neither helped nor hampered by a clear definition of expressions.

To Martin: Information such as edition must be the basis for deciding the expression (but not the only field for this) even though MARC field 250 often is regarded as closely connected with the physical document.

It would be interesting to get prototypes where one was very restrictive in creating new expressions and the other creating new expression for every new edition, and to see how users would react to the different systems.

But for this we would need good user interfaces as well as prototype systems. We would not need a large database, though.

Liv A. Holm

Liv Aasa Holm, 19/09/2003, 15:08
Re: Editions

FRBR Listserv Archive

Yes, I agree that marketing has a lot to say in how publishers show new editions or imprints. The question is: Does it matter? When it is VERY important in some cases that the new edition is marked clearly by the system as something new (new expression), can we live with the fact that in some cases two expressions should have been one?

Could be interesting to get some statistics for how often (in non-fiction) a new edition actually is a new expression. I can only speak for my own subject, computer science. There certainly a new edition of a textbook is different from the previous one.

Liv A. Holm

Ketil Albertsen, 19/09/2003, 15:20

Re: Editions

Liv Aasa Holm:

> Then information such as 9. and 10. edition should have been 9. and 10.

> impressions (*opplag* in Norwegian).

Norwegian "opplag" corresponds to "printing" or "impression" in English, doesn't it?

I have never seen "9th edition" / "10th edition" been used in English without there being some sort of editorial work, some change to the contents of the book. So I don't think you are describing an actual situation - neither (Norw:) "utgave" nor "edtion" is used to refer to an imprint.

There is a bigger problem with "hardbound edition" and "paperback edition" - the only difference is the quality of the paper and other physical materials. Maybe you can make librarians stop using those terms, but I don't think that would stop the book industry.

For all practical purposes, an "edition" is "something that is assigned another ISBN". An impression (*opplag*) is not.

> An English edition, a German edition, a French edition are clearly different

> expressions. An abridged edition is also a new expression.

I mostly agree... but, see below-

> Again we have to clarify the expression level.

> And another thing: How much harm will it do if we treat all editions as

> different expressions? (This is how the FRBR can be read).

"Editions" in which sense? An expression is an abstraction of a set of manifestations. "Abstraction is the ability to hide detail and concentrate on general, common properties of a set of objects" (Tsichritzis & Loehovsky).

Those details of the Manifestation level that we want to hide include at least those related to physical production, like paper quality, number of copies etc.

Those common properties we want to concentrate on are clearly related to contents. Drawing the line is still difficult: Are typos related to physical production - a detail we want to hide?

Most people would probably say: Yes, the creator of the expression never intended to make two different expressions, one with the typo, another one without. The creation is one.

> How can we verify that a novel published in two different series are the

> same expression (if the same national language)? In one series they may

> have modernised the language to some extent without stating this anywhere.

Moving into the "fine print"... Let me do it stepwise: I have seen old Norwegian books capitalizing nouns, German style. Then a new printing is made, and nouns are no longer capitalized. Does that imply that the abstract ideas of the work are now expressed differently?

The words are all the same! If the answer is "yes": If the book is set using an all-uppercase typeface, is that a new expression, too? What about these typefaces of mixed small/large, but same shape, letters (I don't know the English term - "kapit ler" in Norwegian), would that create a new expression, too?

If the answer was "no": So you can correct typos, you can change capitalization. Can you change the spelling in accordance to updated rules for correct spelling - say, replacing the German double-s with two s-es? It most likely was not the author's intention to express his thoughts in a different way. In fact, *not* changing the spelling may in some cases be rather misleading: If Ibsen's "contemporary" plays were

FRBR Listserv Archive

presented in the original orthography, they would certainly not appear as contemporary, but rather as archaic. Ibsen never intended these plays to appear as archaic; updating the spelling ensures that the text expresses the same abstract contents today as it did in the late 1800s (at least to a higher degree).

So where do we stop? Replacing late 1800 Norwegian with 2003 Norwegian, or with Swedish, where is the principal difference? What about a German or an English translation? ... Where do we cross the line?

I prefer to see a new expression as a result of a willed act - someone **intended** to express things differently. A translation to a different language is a deliberate action, aimed at expressing the ideas in a different manner. Updating the spelling to be consistent with new spelling rules is a mechanical process. - But I must admit that the line is not always clearly drawn.

> *Is it not better to establish clear rules such as:*

> *new edition results in a new expression. Always.*

OK, but what constitutes a new edition? Are you saying that a spelling correction is a new edition?

> *How would these rules influence the searching and presentation? Would it be*

> *more difficult to present the search results to the users? Maybe, but I*

> *think not.*

Which is more common in libraries: Customers who search for a given novel, or dissertation, or textbook - regardless of whether the text uses 1939 or 1951 spelling? Or customers who search for the 1939 spelling, and cannot use the 1951 spelling edition?

I guess the first alternative is the more common. Most customers care about content, not form. And that applies both to typographical and orthographical form.

There **are** customers who reject any text in a spelling different from their own, and would rather be without the text than with the 1939 spelling one. When you've searched up the (one!) expression of the work they ask for, you look at the list of manifestations of that work, and if you find no acceptable candidates - well, that's it.

You can't satisfy that customer. All those other customers who care about the contents will see a much better organized search result, where identical contents is presented as one, rather than as several.

Liv also wrote:

> *In most textbooks a new edition means changes to the content. And it does*

> *not say anywhere (except in the preface) that the content has been*

> *modified/rearranged etc.*

That's another difficult question: The arrangement of elements certainly can convey information - most definitely in certain classes of poetry.

Even novels and non-fiction books may be strongly affected by their presentation, and some authors make a great issue about it. Even putting together three more or less independent novels into one volume (take the Bjørneboe "History of cruelty" as an example!) adds something to it which may or may not correspond to the author's intention. (In the case of Bjørneboe, it certainly was the author's intention to consider the three novels as a whole.) Do we create a new expression when a book is published in two volumes rather than one, in one volume rather than three? Or are those details of physical format?

Again: A deliberate action to **create** something new by putting pieces together in a different way, should, in my opinion, be treated as a new expression. A simple, "mindless" (with respect to the intellectual contents) reorganization should not be.

I see the obvious problems of basing a definition on individual judgement and "the creator's intentions". You will frequently have to make judgements anyway, and I think it is easier - and it corresponds closer to the needs of the users - to judge whether there is an **intention** to create something new, rather than deciding which minimal more or less **unintentional** changes (from the creator's point of view) of the content should be defined as a new expression!

Ketil Albertsen

Project engineer - "Paradigma - Preservation, Arrangement & Retrieval of Assorted Digital Materials", The National Library of Norway - www.nb.no

John Attig, 19/09/2003, 15:56

Re: Editions

FRBR Listserv Archive

One thing that I have found missing in this discussion is the distinction between "edition" and "edition statement".

The "edition statement" is an attribute of a manifestation; it consists of text that appears on particular physical embodiments of an expression. It is important not to equate the edition statement with the underlying concept of edition.

The concept of "edition" as traditionally defined, and in particular as defined in the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, combines distinct intellectual or artistic content (expression) with distinct issuance (expression). Thus there are cases such as simultaneous publication by two agencies (usually in two countries); these are distinct editions (manifestations) but usually NOT distinct expressions. As others have noted, the traditional concept of "edition" does not translate well into the FRBR model.

John Attig
Penn State University Libraries

Ketil Albertsen, 19/09/2003, 16:01

Re: Editions

Liv Aasa Holm:

> You know, I would prefer (as a user) to see different editions (even 1. and
> 12. as in the example) as separate entries in a search result as long as
> they are grouped under the same Work. Since we can not know whether they
> are different or equal I would like them to be separate entries in the
> display of the search result (and with the manifestation as another level of
> display). This because the DATE of the edition is important in many cases.

An expression is an abstraction - the essential common properties - of a set of manifestations. The different manifestations have minor properties distinguishing them.

Which minor, distinguishing properties do these manifestations have? It seems to me that you want to create an expression for each manifestation! These minor properties would be things like typos, spelling and the like, along with the "packaging" (typography, binding etc.).

From Liv's earlier posting:

> As for when "something" is a new WORK. Small changes and updates, e.g. more
> stuff about object-oriented systems in a textbook about database theory
> should not be regarded as a new work in my opinion.

Hopefully not! I'd go as far as to saying that as long as the author hasn't changed his ideas about something (or he wants to express a different idea), the work is the same.

> Besides, as

> long as the authors view a new edition as just that, it is not a new work.

Fully agreed. But as I wrote before: As long as it has not been the intention of the author to express his thoughts differently, it is not a new expression, either.

(Back to Liv's more recent posting:)

> Sometimes you can be sure what the first edition will look like, but not be
> sure of anything in the 10.

If you by "look like" refer to external, physical looks, that is certainly a question of manifestation (with a few obvious exceptions, as I mentioned before, like certain kinds of "graphical" poetry).

> But I

> think we may give poorer service to our users if we miss out on an
> expression compared to making an expression too many.

Mostly, I disagree. If your customer is asking for an item - a physical copy - you never stop at the expression level anyway; you select one of the manifestations.

You never "miss out an expression". What happens is that the expression you find covers a somewhat larger group of different manifestations. E.g. all the Norwegian editions of "Sophie's world" have *one* expression entry, rather than six or eight. Or even two.

None of the eight different editions are lost - they all appear under the same expression. I don't see how that could be a poorer service to users.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Yes, you may be right that date is important in many cases. But the date will certainly be available for each of the manifestations of the expression. I think it is far more important that "Sophie's world" from 1991 and from 1997 are the same novel, one hit. It is more important to see the novel as one expression, the videofilm as another expression, the audio book as a third one - rather than confusing the search result with a number of functionally identical entries, differing only by date (and possibly publisher, binding, typography etc.).

The date isn't *that* important, is it? Is it more (or equally) essential to distinguish between the 1991 and 1997 edition of the novel, than between the novel and the audio book?

Me thinks not.

Ketil Albertsen

Ketil Albertsen, 19/09/2003, 16:15

Re: Editions

Göran Berntsson:

> *If you take an old Swedish novel you may read on the
> titlepage "Tredje upplagan" (= 3. ed.) but it is totally obvious that it is
> absolutely nothing but the third printing of the same expression.*

Is that really a correct translation? Is "Tredje upplagan" "3. ed." in Swedish? In Norwegian, "opplag" is "printing" - "utgave" is "edition". So "tredje opplag" and "tredje utgave" are different things - 3rd printing and 3rd edition, respectively.

Swedish and Norwegian may be different with respect to this term, but I must admit that that would surprise me.

> *What shall guide our judgement of manifestation or expression?*

> *The very content of the document or the publisher's way of putting it?*

I try to hold up the **creator's intent** as the major guideline.

"Creator" will often be the author, but it could also be a translator or some other role affecting the intellectual content.

Furthermore: Interpretation of "the very content" depends very much on what level of abstraction you are considering. At the Expression level, we are at "intellectual content", which is abstracted from physical typography etc. The question is which properties are understood by "intellectual content" - does a choice of spelling affect the intellectual content? In some cases it **does** - in some novels you will see e.g. a particular atmosphere or some individual characterized through the use of language, e.g. using archaic word forms. But usually it is not.

Ketil Albertsen

Gunilla Jonsson, 19/09/2003, 16:59

Re: Editions

The difference between edition and edition statement is an important distinction, you are perfectly right! It has been underlying our discussion but not spelled out, thank you for that.

You do not account for the definition of edition from AACR quite correctly, however. That definition is actually quite equal to the ISO definition I quoted in an earlier mail. Your example, simultaneous publication by two agencies is, in most cases I'm sure, an example of two different "issues" (absolutely distinct manifestations) of the same edition, that is, they are produced from the same act of registration.

Now, I wish you all a nice weekend!

Gunilla

Joe Zeeman, 22/09/2003, 11:14

Re: Editions

Ketil Albertsen writes:

>*I have never seen "9th edition" / "10th edition" been used in English
>without there being some sort of editorial work, some change to the
>contents of the book. So I don't think you are describing an actual*

FRBR Listserv Archive

>situation - neither (Norw:) "utgave" nor "edtion" is used to
>refer to an imprint.

There are 10s of thousands of examples. Traditionally in English printing an "edition" refers to all those copies of a work printed from a single setting of type. In the hand-press era, the type was composed, a certain number of copies were printed (often around 1500) and the type was immediately distributed again. Often during the course of printing a typo was discovered and corrected, so that some copies of an edition have the error and others don't. This leads to the more general working definition of an edition as being "all copies printed from substantially the same setting of type" (if I recollect Fredson Bowers correctly). When new copies were required, type was composed again, more copies were printed and the type was distributed. The intention in these editions was certainly NOT to make editorial changes, rather the opposite: it was desired to obtain additional copies to sell that were textually identical to the earlier edition. Of course, compositor errors inevitably crept in, but they were not intentional, and, in my view they do not constitute a sufficient change to justify a new expression of the work

When stereotype plates began to be used for printing books (sometime around 1900, or even later), the distinction between impression and edition begins to be blurred, since multiple impressions can be made from the same set of plates. New editions were created when editorial changes were required or when the stereotype plates became sufficiently worn that further impressions could not be taken. The former case seems to me to result in a new expression, but the latter case doesn't.

With computer typesetting, and the current approach of typesetting straight from the author's electronic manuscript, things become much more complex. I would argue, however, that the original definition, that an edition is all copies printed from substantially the same instance of composing the letters (in this case on a computer keyboard) is still germane. Thus multiple "printings", multiple "thousands", large print and regular print "editions", and paperback and hard cover "editions", all deriving from the same marked-up electronic text, are all different manifestations of the same expression. This is true even if the texts contain minor corrections intended to more accurately reflect the author's original expression.

One rule of thumb that I would suggest for librarians (who clearly don't have time to carefully compare the text of successive editions of a work in trying to ascertain whether substantial changes have been made) is that an edition statement should be used as the basis for inferring a new expression only when it clearly indicates that the edition contains intentional authorial changes to the substance of the text, as in "newly corrected", "revised", "augmented", "with additions", "updated for the 2003 tax year", etc. If we don't do this, then the distinction we are trying to maintain between manifestation and expression becomes meaningless - pretty well every manifestation would be a new expression. Certainly in English-language cataloging, where the edition is the basis for creating a new bibliographic record, pretty well every bibliographic record would be treated as a separate expression and there would end up being no manifestation clustering within expressions.

Joe Zeeman

Göran Berntsson, 22/09/2003, 11:15

Re: Editions

Ketil Albertsen wrote (on the Swedish term "upplaga" and Norwegian "opplag"):

"Swedish and Norwegian may be different with respect to this term, but I must admit that that would surprise me."

Yes, Ketil, there is a difference between our languages: Swedish "upplaga" corresponds to "edition" and "tryckning" corresponds to "printing". But the point of my little remark is that publisher in different times and from different reasons don't make distinctions between these terms in Swedish.

Ketil Albertsen wrote:

"Furthermore: Interpretation of "the very content" depends very much on what level of abstraction you are considering."

I find it a little hard to use the very term "content" on any level above manifestation. If we, like Liv, try to split MARC records on Works, Expressions and Manifestations, "the very content" must be the content of the item (of a manifestation) at hand, isn't it so?

FRBR Listserv Archive

Best wishes
Göran

Antoinette Le Maire, 22/09/2003, 11:17
Re: FRBR implementation

Hello,

Sorry for cross-posting

UCL is implementing a FRBR catalog. We are working with the VTLS implementation of FRBR. One of the requirements we have is to submit our bibliographic records to the National Union Catalog. They cannot accept FRBR records so we have to "unFRBRize" the records. We tried to figure out a logical method for the "unFRBRize" process. It is rather simple when there is only one expression and one manifestation under the work. However, in the general case when there are multiple works in the tree linked to multiple expressions and multiple manifestations we do not know how to specify what constitutes a "record" to be sent to the union catalog. Any ideas?

Antoinette le Maire

Service d'informatique administrative - Université catholique de Louvain

Liv Aasa Holm, 22/09/2003, 13:17
Re: Editions

Many interesting comments so far. And they all lead to new thoughts.

1. What is exactly an expression. Ketil mentions the author's intention. But the author may be long dead and "someone" has decided to "brush up" the novel or play or whatever. It is still regarded as the same Work. And the author may never have intended such a brush up. Therefore we can not limit expressions to whatever the author intended.

I would say that expression is a "variant" of the Work. The border between expression and manifestation is not a sharp one. Correcting misprints is certainly not creating a new expression. Moving a play's context from the 1930s to 2003 I would say is definitely creating a new expression. The modernising of the language (not just the spelling) in a novel, could also be a new expression.

2. It will be very difficult to decide if we should create a new expression or not automatically from existing MARC records. If we can not use field 250, what can we use?

3. The different meanings (or interpretations) of "edition" are interesting. That publishers have used it for "new printings" (and maybe still do) is something we can not really do anything about. But is it not possible in most cases for the cataloguer to see if it is a new edition or a new printing? If cataloguers could use differ between the two, then we could use the data in separating expressions and manifestations, even though the cataloguer did not use a FRBR system.

I do not think the danger of creating too many expressions would lead to a 1:1 relation between expressions and manifestations. There are many quite clear cases where we have several manifestations of one expression.

But is the risk of too few manifestations for some expressions the only reason why we should not always interpret a new edition as a new expression?

Do we here see a difference between fiction and non-fiction? If it is clearly stated in the document that this edition is a revised edition, will this be included in the bibliographic record? And how? In a note or in 250-field?

I would be very interested in moving this discussion to a clearer definition of expression. I do believe that the expression level in the model is a good tool for structuring both searching and display of search result. But we have to agree on what should be covered by the expression level and how to identify it in bibliographic records (existing and future records).

Liv

Ketil Albertsen, 22/09/2003, 16:35
Re: Editions

FRBR Listserv Archive

Liv Aasa Holm:

> 1. *What is exactly an expression. Ketil mentions the author's intention.*
> *But the author may be long dead and "someone" has decided to "brush up" the*
> *novel or play or whatever. It is still regarded as the same Work. And the*
> *author may never have intended such a brush up. Therefore we can not limit*
> *expressions to whatever the author intended.*

I used the term "author" for simplicity - I could have written "creator". If some artist bases some creation on an old work, he creates a new work. There is of course a problem of defining when something is a new work - updating the spelling would certainly not qualify as a new work, but creating a movie based on a novel may be. Arranging a musical work for a different set of instruments is considered a work worthy of copyright protection in Norway; it is a new derived work. Note that the work is the **arrangement** part of the end result, not the entire thing.

Whether the new musical arrangement is a Work in FRBR sense, or "merely" a new expression, is not given. It may be, it may not. Did the creator attempt to express some artistic idea beyond what the original composer had in mind? Simply scale transposition, e.g. from a Bb clarinet piece to a C flute piece, certainly does not add a significant creative element. In most cases, arranging a symphony concerto for a string quartet does not add much creativity, either. So these would probably be classified as different Expressions. If a novel is made into a radio play, more or less as a simple transcription from printed words to spoken voices and sound effects, that is probably a new Expression - but there are most certainly radio plays which deviates from the book they are based on that they are definitely creative Works (although they are based on other works). My impression is that most movie makers, making books into movies try to add something that the book didn't have - sometimes even to a degree that leads to lawsuits... (especially if the author is still alive).

(I repeatedly come back to this: FRBR needs strengthened tools for managing relationships between works, components of works, works derived from other works. Between expressions, components of expressions, variant expressions, accumulating expressions such as Internet blogs and serials etc. etc. I don't think we will get our thoughts about expressions and works straightened out until we get better tools to manage object relationships **within** each abstraction layer.)

The bottom line is: You cannot make any hard, fixed rules - it must be based on individual judgement. If the creator of some new "thing" only tried to express the contents of the work in some other way, without any primary intention of making a new, creative work, that is a new expression. It doesn't really matter whether it is the original author/composer/... that does this or not. However, if this person intends not to adapt, but to add to or modify, an existing work to any significant degree, he **does** make a new work.

The Work vs. Expression discussion is very similar to the Expression vs. Manifestation discussion...

> *Correcting misprints is certainly not creating a new expression.*

Agreed.

> *Moving a play's context from the 1930s to 2003 I would say is definitely creating a*
> *new expression.*

In most cases, I would agree.

> *The modernising of the language (not just the spelling) in a novel, could also be a*
> *new expression.*

It **could** be. It also could not. If it once was a contemporary story, and leaving it un-modernised makes it appear very outdated, but a more or less mechanical (with no creative element) replacement of characters (i.e. spelling) and words with modern forms may ensure that the novel still appears as a contemporary story, the answer is not as clear cut.

Of course: I am talking about moderate changes. E.g. in a novel from the 50s, people might address anyone but near family using "De" (Norwegian, corresponding to the German polite form "Sie") - they did, in those days. Today, no one says "De", we all say "du", just like English speaking say "you" to everyone. Using "du" in the 2003 edition expresses the same as "De" did in the 1950 edition; both are the everyday term of its time. English translations of either would be identical, "you". So, modernising at this level could be classified together with spelling updates.

I will suggest as a rule of thumb for such modernisations:

FRBR Listserv Archive

If translation to another language should be different for the two versions, then the modernisation may be considered as a new Expression. If the translation is unaffected, then it is not a new Expression - the new version expresses exactly the same as the old one.

(Both "De" and "du" translates to English "you". For German: Where "De" was used in the 50s, translates to "Sie" - and in those situations, even modern Norwegian "du" should be translated to "Sie", not to "Du". While "du" *may* translate to German "Du", these are situations where even the 1950 Norwegian text would use "du", not "De".)

This is a rule of thumb only, not intended as absolute truth! (And of course I assume that the translation process does not lead to a loss of information that hides the nuances.)

> 2. *It will be very difficult to decide if we should create a new expression or not automatically from existing MARC records. If we can not use field 250, what can we use?*

I don't think we will be able to make these decisions automatically - there must be an element of human judgement.

> *But is the risk of too few manifestations for some expressions the only reason why we should not always interpret a new edition as a new expression?*

No - the number of expressions, that being "too few" or "too many", should not at all be significant. What *is* significant is whether some creator (original one, or other) had an intention to express the ideas of the work in a distinctly different way from other ways to express those same ideas. Why was the new edition at all published? If the answer is "to make more money from the book" (or whatever), there is a great probability that nothing is expressed differently in the new edition, only the wrapping is different, so it is not a new Expression.

A library user requesting information about the expressions of a work should be presented with a list of different ways this work has been expressed, not the different ways these expressions has been wrapped as "editions". For that, we've got Manifestations!

> *Do we here see a difference between fiction and non-fiction?*

Not in principle, but maybe in practice: Fiction is frequently republished in a different form without changing a single word, but in different wrappings. This *may* happen with non-fiction, too - especially "old classics". But the majority of non-fiction works which are published in new editions also have revisions in contents. You rarely see "revised editions" of novels - it happens, but not very often.

> *I would be very interested in moving this discussion to a clearer definition of expression.*

Certainly. But I think putting too much emphasis on MARC 250 tends to blur it. MARC 250 is primarily related to the physical format and production of a publication, while the Expression level relates to the contents - not to the wrapper and the way we organize and administer the products. I think that to reach a clearer definition of expression, we must disregard all aspects of physical representation, wrapping and handling.

Yours respectfully
Ketil Albertsen

Liv Aasa Holm, 23/09/2003, 09:27

Re: Editions

It would of course be fine if we could just disregard all existing MARC records and start cataloguing everything from scratch and according to a fully developed FRBR system. But the case is that there are so many million MARC records out there and to convert those to a FRBR model we have to find a way to use the information IN the existing MARC records. So we are faced with both:

- defining what the expression level should cover (according to the Italian analysis it covers too much)

- defining an algorithm for automatically identification of the expression level. It is not so difficult to identify the Work level and/or the manifestation level.

Some of you have stressed the difference between the edition and the edition statement. In my ignorance I thought the edition statement carried information about the edition. If that is not the case, where is the information about the edition stored?

FRBR Listserv Archive

Let me quote from the report: "...expression: the intellectual or artistic realization of a work in the form of alpha-numeric, musical, or choreographic notation, sound, image, object, movement, etc. or any combination of such forms.

An expression is the specific intellectual or artistic form that a work takes each time it is 'realized'."

Leaving aside the discussion of "edition" for the moment: if there exist a translation of a work into english, that is an expression. But if another person translates the same work into english that will be another expression because two translators will not translate in exactly the same way. After all there will be a reason for the second translation.

So, how can we know that it is the same translation that has been used when the work is published in e.g. two very different series?

In "Displays for multiple versions from MARC 21 and FRBR" prepared by Tom Delsey (2002.06.27), he treats two different editions of Sister Carrie as two manifestations. One published is the Modern Library ed. (from 1997) the other The Pennsylvania ed. (from 1981). Since the novel was published around 1907 I am quite sure that both the Modern Library ed. and the Pennsylvania ed. do not use the original language. But do those two editions use the same "modernization"? If not, they must be two different expressions.

So back to editions: do we have any better source for deciding expressions? We should not use edition (statement) alone, of course. It would be nice to use language and translator etc. as well. but can we rely on these elements being present in the records?

Best

Liv

Several groups have tried to convert MARC records to FRBR objects (Hegna and Murtomaa, OCLC-project, LC etc.). But as long as there is not a clear definition of the expression level we do not get "perfect" results. And as Hegna and Murtomaa points out, the data in the MARC-records are not as good as they should have been.

Ketil Albertsen, 22/09/2003, 16:35

Re: Editions

Liv Aasa Holm:

> It would of course be fine if we could just disregard all existing MARC
> records and start cataloguing everything from scratch and according to a
> fully developed FRBR system. But the case is that there are so many million
> MARC records out there and to convert those to a FRBR model we have to find
> a way to use the information IN the existing MARC records.

That certainly is a problem - or at least a major task.

Yet:

When we try to define/clarify new concepts, in my opinion we should disregard the magnitude of the conversion task from some other conceptual framework. If we let MARC concepts dictate FRBR concepts simply to make conversion from MARC simpler, then we will not have the freedom to create the best definitions.

FRBR shouldn't be made a "MARC II", but a complete rethinking, based on *MARC experience* - not on MARC. FRBR is quite a lot more than grouping MARC fields into groups called "Work", "Expression" and "Manifestation". Defining Expression as "an entity defined by a MARC 250 field" sounds to me as MARC II, not as a rethinking of concepts.

Rethinking *will* incur increased conversion expenses, but I think it is worth it in the long run.

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Liv Aasa Holm, 23/09/2003, 14:07

Re: Editions

How nice it would be if we *could* disregard all previous work. Yes, then we could design a perfect model and start from scratch.

But there are a couple of problems. Such as:

FRBR Listserv Archive

1. What is really a perfect model. Perfect for whom? I am thinking of search and retrieval, but different user groups will view different models as "perfect".

For instance those who are interested in how an author has used the language will not be interested in grouping together all versions of a Work. That is, such users would certainly prefer to look at the group of manifestations (or one) that really contained the original spelling, use of words and phrases etc. The original expression. Not a modernized version.

Another group of users may not care what "language" the Work is presented in. It is the content that matters. They would prefer all manifestations (in one language) grouped under the same expression.

Other groups of users may not be able to read an "archaic" version of the language and should be guided to newer expressions.

2. We can not afford to forget about the past. We can not afford to catalogue hundreds of millions documents again. We have to be able to use what we have. Therefore the borders between Work, Expression and Manifestation will have to be practically possible to recognize.

Sorry for all the misprints etc. hopefully the meaning is fairly clear.

Just now I am going through the Access database that LC (or T. Delsey?) has created with mapping between FRBR attributes and MARC 21 fields/subfields.

It surprises me that the information about a translator of a document is not included for identification of expressions.

Liv

Norberto Manzanos, 24/09/2003, 09:45

Re: Editions

Hello.

I have some ideas and a lot of doubts about this discussion. Let me try to summarize some of the problems.

Leaving aside the problem of the term "edition" and its meaning, the fact that two "editions" should be consider as different things or not is defined by user needs. Someone could be interested in differences in typography in different editions of a book, specially if the book is an old one. Other people would need any manifestation of any expression of THAT work. Between those extremes, there are hundred with particular needs.

But different manifestation and different expressions are in both cases, different things. The problem is that some people, when open all the expressions of a work, will find more than he expects, while other will find less, and will need to open all the manifestations, and some of them will find much more in that set than he expects.

So, you need tools for filtering data regarding user needs. That way the user can tell he/she needs only augmented editions, or includes everything, even reimpressions, or anything she/he wants.

Then, shouldn't the expression/manifestations question be transparent to the user? Does he/she be trained to deal with such ontological questions?. Or she/he only need a tool to say: "I need all existing versions of that" or "I need the most complete version of that" and so on.

But this seems to be a software question, not a catalographic problem. Is it?

I think it is, and it's not.

How will know the software what is exactly the needs of the user, how will it make the filters.

The traditional answer is:

Well, you have a table with all possible values of field "edition". So, the user can choose from that which of them he/she wants.

So, the user doesn't need to know what is "expression/manifestation" but he needs to know all variants and uses of "edition", "reimpression", etc. I think we are not helping at all.

Well, you can add some intelligence to the software, to make it more friendly, group the different uses of statement of edition in categories. Anytime you have a new variant, you need to modify the software. And, if the former case the user needs to be almost an expert librarian, now, the librarian and the user are in different worlds, they have different languages and can not communicate.

FRBR Listserv Archive

If we think in an object environment, we can think things like edition not in terms of data, but in terms of behaviour. Different editions has different behaviours. They relates with their siblings in different ways, more or less closer. These differences can be labeled with a great variety of names; if doesn't matter.

And this lead me to a question that nobody answer in my presentation mail (you all were on holiday? my English is impossible?) ;=))

Is IFLA-FRBR thought as an entity-relation model, or is it an object-model? In other words, are you thinking in terms of data, records, algorithms, and so on, or in terms of objects and behaviour?

I notice that the first level of the model (i.e. work, expression, manifestation, item, agent, concept, event, place) since they are derived from entity, they seems to be thought as objects (but could be E-R too). But when we look inside and see attributes as "title", "context", etc, we have to conclude that this attributes are simple strings, fields, i.e., one dimensional data, not objects.

This is an important question I can't find clearly defined in FRBR bibliography. It's clear that FRBR want to build a conceptual model, not a data model, but it's not clear which is the way to that model. I think that the E-R way is the way to a data model and the way of a conceptual model is the object paradigm.

Cheers.

Norberto Manzanos

CAICYT www.caicyt.gov.ar

Liv Aasa Holm, 24/09/2003, 10:14

Re: Editions

Many good questions and suggestions.

First: The IFLA-group used the ER-analysis method. A conceptual model is supposed to have no strings to actual data models. But the conceptual model described in the FRBR report looks more like a relational model than an object model. Dan Matei has produced an object model (figures) by the way.

I agree that there are approximately as many user "needs" for searching and display as there are users. And that some of the problems in that area can be handled by software. But in order not to have to change the software every time we get new "object types" or "entity types" etc. we need a good data model. A data model that can handle the different needs.

Of course we will not require the users to know about differences between Work, Expression and Manifestation.

Since it is simpler to display some manifestations together (sorted in some way) that actually belong to different expressions, than to separate manifestations on different expressions (when that is the need), manifestations should be grouped by expressions.

So we are back at the questions: What is an expression and how do we identify it.

Moving to a pure object model may be the solution, but I am not quite convinced. You would still have to solve the problem: Is this a new expression?

OODBMSs have some nice features, but also some draw-backs. Another practical problem is of course the availability of well-tested and suitable (for libraries) OODBMS. But maybe you were thinking of the Object-Relational DBMS.

Liv

Barbara B. Tillett, 26/09/2003, 14:52

Re: FRBR implementation

Within the discussions for the IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code as well as later discussions within the Joint Steering Committee for Revisions of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, the focus of bibliographic records remains the manifestations, with collocating devices used to identify the contained work(s) and expression(s). So we will continue to have the bibliographic records provide bibliographic description following the ISBD standards plus access points for the contained works/expressions by means of uniform title access points (added entries in the old parlance).

The records then for a union catalog would focus on the manifestations. Hopefully the union catalog would also provide collocation by works and expressions, using the

FRBR Listserv Archive

access points included in the manifestation records. To unFRBR-ize you would work from the manifestation level and use that for the base record to which you would add the uniform titles for the expression(s) and work(s) that are contained. - Barbara Tillett

Ian Fairclough, 29/09/2003, 16:22

Re: The Book of Kells

Dear FRBR readers,

In the FRBR scheme: Where does The Book of Kells fit? Is it a work, expression, manifestation, or item?

You may wish to consider LC authority record n 83009468 for the heading "Book of Kells" and the note in that record "Heading represents the manuscript as a physical entity, including its decoration. For textual contents of the ms. use: Bible. N.T. Gospels. Latin. Book of Kells. [date, as appropriate]."

If this question has already been addressed, please accept my apologies and I'd appreciate being directed to the discussion.

Thanks for reading - Ian

Ian Fairclough

Marion (Ohio) Public Library

Dan Matei, 07/10/2003, 22:43

Re: The Book of Kells

Dear FRBRians

I see our genuine cataloguers wait for an amateur (like me) to accept the challenge ? Well, as a brave "agent provocateur", I'll take my chances.

So, in my (current) opinion:

The Book of Kells (i.e. the piece at the Trinity College) could be seen as:

a) the unique item which exemplifies a manifestation which embodies medieval Latin textual expressions of six works: the four gospels, the (fragment of) Hebrew names and the Eusebian canons.

b) the unique item which exemplifies a manifestation which embodies the original expression of a (mainly) graphical work known as "The Book of Kells".

Due to the relative importance of the two interpretations, I prefer the second.

So, dear Ian, my own blunt answer to your question:

> In the FRBR scheme: Where does The Book of Kells fit? Is it a work,

> expression, manifestation, or item?

is:

The exemplar of The Book of Kells (A. I. 6, at Trinity College, Dublin,) is an item.

However, in a FRBR catalogue, it should generate: an item record, a manifestation record, an expression record, a work record.

Plus some related records: works + expressions for: the four gospels, the Hebrew names, the Eusebian canons.

Criticism ?

Dan Matei

Ian Fairclough, 08/10/2003, 22:08

Re: The Book of Kells

Dear FRBR readers,

Because a discussion that may be of interest to all has occurred mostly offlist, I'm providing this summary.

A short while ago I asked: In the FRBR scheme: Where does The Book of Kells fit? Is it a work, expression, manifestation, or item? You may wish to consider LC authority record n 83009468 for the heading "Book of Kells" and the note in that record "Heading represents the manuscript as a physical entity, including its decoration. For textual contents of the ms. use: Bible. N.T. Gospels. Latin. Book of Kells. [date, as appropriate]." ...

FRBR Listserv Archive

I received this private response from Barbara Tillett, reproduced here with permission: The original book itself (in several volumes) is a unique item that is also the manifestation containing an expression of the Bible, New Testament, Gospels (work). This is a case where there is only one item for the manifestation (not multiple copies of that particular manifestation). Other manifestations have been produced over the years, such as exact reproductions.

To which I replied: ... People searching for The Book of Kells (or reproduction thereof) will consider it a work rather than a manifestation of one of the numerous expressions of the Gospels ... some people might not be able to identify the text if asked. ...

Gerhard Riesthuis responded on the list, with substantially the same argument as Barbara: "In my opinion "Book of Kells" is according to the LC authority record the title of the manifestation, and "Bible. N.T. Gospels. etc." the title of the expression(s). Any manifestation is a "physical entity" and no "physical entity" can be an expression.

But Dan Mattei posted further comments on the list this morning, to which I've replied privately: The more I think about it, the more I believe that sticking to what Barbara said is the right approach to the situation.

Considering the graphics as a "work" is understandable, but ultimately erroneous in terms of FRBR. ... The Book of Kells is, I believe, a touchstone for FRBR. If we can get this right, we can probably solve any problem!

And Dan responds: ... I fully agree with your reply to Barbara and I disagree with your second thought. How many people are looking for the Gospels inside The Book of Kells? So, who are our "clients" for the Book? The "original creation" aspect (i.e. 'work') of the Book is much more important than the "Gospels edition" aspect of it. Well, maybe the dual nature of the thing deserves a special treatment(?). Again, I have the same problem with "Codex Aureus" [The Lorsch Gospels]

<http://www.finns-books.com/lorsch.htm>. And of course there are many, many more of the kind.

Quoting Dan's questions, I replied: "How many people are looking for the Gospels inside The Book of Kells?" Excellent question, Dan - though judging from the authority record I'd guess that it has a text that is in some way distinct. And "So, who are our "clients" for the Book?" To answer this question properly means that we must insure that proper access of all kind is provided at the manifestation level! Ditto for ... other manuscripts known for their artistic etc. worth rather than the text.

That's as far as the offlist discussion has gone. Does anyone else see a problem here? Will FRBR prevail "as is"? Or does it require modification to accommodate situations where the physical artifact as a manifestation comes to be perceived as a "work" in its own right?

To avoid further off-list discussion: If you reply, my preference is that it go to the list, although private replies are welcome and will be forwarded without attribution unless you specify otherwise.

Sincerely - Ian

Ian Fairclough

Marion (Ohio) Public Library

Göran Berntsson, 11/10/2003, 20:19

Re: The Book of Kells

I don't think is very often that you are allowed to *smile* in our profound discussions of the meaning of "work", "expression" etc.

But when this questions is asked I think it is time:

"How many people are looking for the Gospels inside The Book of Kells?"

Isn't this a brilliant question to those among us who argue that "Book of Kells" is not a work?

Best wishes

Göran Berntsson

Dan Matei, 14/10/2003, 11:02

Re: The Book of Kells

FRBR Listserv Archive

Dear Göran

Just to keep you smiling :-), I'll ask another (related) question:

How many people are looking for the Schiller's "An die Freude" inside the Beethoven's 9th ? If I try hard, I can argue that the 9th symphony is just a particular expression of Schiller's Ode to Joy, i.e. its 'musical expression', which happens to be produced by Beethoven :-)

I agree that someone looking for all the manifestations containing expression of the Gospels should retrieve the Book of Kells. I wonder if someone looking for the manifestations containing expressions of "An die Freude" should retrieve all the CDs with the 9th.

On the other hand, if you think 'The Book of Kells' is not a work, see what some Irish has to say about it:

"The Book of Kells is not simply a religious manuscript. True, it contains the four gospels of Mark, Mathew, Luke and John and that was the sole original purpose of the book. But its age and its design, although damaged, allow us a glorious glimpse into the art and style of ancient Ireland. The book is, quite simply, considered a crowning glory of the Celtic art form, and possibly one of the most important treasures of Western Europe." (cf. <http://www.irishclans.com/articles/bookofkells.html>).

Besides, going back to the basics: what is the FRBR's point of recording "works" ? Not to offer good, natural "collocating points" for the large variety of manifestations ? Now, please try a Google search on "Book of Kells" and tell me if you think there are not enough manifestations which deserve to be collocated under the "The Book of Kells" entry.

Cheers,

Dan Matei

Matthew Beacom, 18/11/2003, 11:29

Re: FRIDAY, or, turning the bibliographic entities hierarchy (WEMI) upside down?

Hello all,

On many of the lists I subscribe to, Friday is the day for sending messages that are not completely serious or even outright silly. I don't think my message today is entirely silly, but I think it would benefit from being read in a mood of playful indulgence. And although I am smiling as I write this, I am also quite serious about it. I think it could matter more than a little.

I recently gave a brief talk on FRBR to some coworkers in my library and afterward one of the listeners and I talked about the bibliographic entities hierarchy for a while. My coworker thought the Work--Expression--Manifestation--Item structure had a Platonic feel since it put the most abstract entity first and at the top of the structure and worked down to the specific, concrete instance. Of course, this is partly just a matter of presentation, but such things often have deeper consequences, too. Perhaps this is such a case.

We began to wonder then if that Platonic orientation of the model may be contributing to some of the confusions and misunderstandings people sometimes have with the FRBR model as they try to understand it or apply it. In my experience, the most common problems seem to come from mistaking the concepts of Work and Expression for things.

We considered, then, the Aristotelian alternative--begin with the specific, concrete instance and work up through increasingly abstract or distant concepts that give meaning to the instance itself. If we turn the model upside down--Item, Manifestation, Expression, and Work--what happens? Does this help people understand that unlike the items that we use--the things we read, listen to, watch, catalog, lend, borrow, spill coffee on, etc.--Work and Expression are ideas that we have about the things we use.

And Manifestation is a bit in-between, isn't it? As the whole set of the specific items that exist it too is concrete and specific--real, I would say. Yet as the _set_ of those specific items it is an idea about a particular bunch of specific things.

So, turned upside down, the hierarchy starts with the item--the thing that we actually use whether we are library users or librarians. And we can consider the item as an instance of a set of similar items. Generally speaking, this is the level at which we in the Anglo-American cataloging community make our bibliographic descriptions.

We can also think of the item in terms of what the FRBR model calls Expression and Work. Coming at these ideas from the item up, I think it is easier to see that these

FRBR Listserv Archive

terms identify concepts that help us understand and contextualize the item we have for our use and are not themselves things we can use--and thus catalog.

Do you see what I mean about turning the bibliographic entities hierarchy (WEMI) upside down? If we were to do that, how would that change people's understanding of the model and how might it change how people use the model in practical applications? I don't think my suggestions changes the model itself. I think it changes how we present it. I do think that change in presentation will change how people understand it and how they imagine using it. I think that turning the model upside down--flipping WEMI to IMEW--will make the model easier to understand and to apply.

One of my college teachers long ago told me that everyone belongs to one of two camps. One is either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. I am, as you might have guessed, an Aristotelian.

I hope the above is of interest to you all and turns out to be of some use.

Matthew Beacom

Liv Aasa Holm, 18/11/2003, 12:45

Re: FRIDAY, or, turning the bibliographic entities hierarchy (WEMI) upside down?

This seems to be the discussion: Bottom-up or Top-down.

Whichever way you prefer you end up with the same result. In some instances (and for some people) it is easier to start with the physical item, for others it is better to start with the most general "idea".

But I presume what makes the difference is whether you are cataloguing or searching. If you are cataloguing, you would start with the item. If you are searching you may start anywhere, but the presentation of the result would be best (in my opinion) if you could see the work level first, then expression etc.

Liv A. Holm

Liv Aasa Holm, 20/11/2003, 10:54

Re: Component parts

Dear colleagues,

After having received so many comments concerning editions, I try another question to the list.

Professor Shoichi Taniguchi has an interesting article in JDOC (vol. 59, No. 6 2003) where component parts of documents are discussed.

Professor Taniguchi divides component parts into two categories:

- content parts
- document parts

then discusses the treatment of them in the FRBR model and the expression-prioritized model.

I have a question about the FRBR-model.

Professor Taniguchi claims that in the FRBR model you may have situations where you have a document part (of a host item, i.e. a part of a Work), but no expression part. But you do have a manifestation part and then an item part.

I have difficulties in finding an example where this could be the case.

And if it is the case, I presume that we then have a whole-part relationship between the manifestation for the host item (Work) and the manifestation for the Work-part (document part).

Another question:

If the component part is of type content part, will a manifestation part have to be created? Always?

I think it is in the manifestation part we can enter statement of responsibility for the part. Of course we will link author to work part, but e.g. "pp. 12 - 23" (if that is the location within the host manifestation) will have to be placed in a manifestation part. Or where?

Are there other types of information about the content part (component part) we want to have in the database which belongs on the manifestation level in FRBR? (=manifestation part) What about colour, reduction ratio etc. Can (or will) those differ between parts in a host item (here content parts, not documents part).

To sum up my questions:

FRBR Listserv Archive

For component parts: which types of group 1 entities do we create for different types of documents. When a Work consists of several parts.
Do there exist good examples for this?

Liv A. Holm

Ian Fairclough, 20/11/2003, 13:49

Re: Component parts

Dear FRBR-list readers,

Not having read Prof. Taniguchi's article I cannot comment on it. But in response to the excerpt below, I wonder whether in some cases the "work" and the "expression" are simply identical. And whether the "expression" and the "manifestation" are also identical in some cases. In which case, logically then all three can be identical. If this is not the case I'd appreciate correction, preferably on the list so that other readers can benefit. (I found it necessary to click "reply all" - if I do get any private responses I'll forward them without attribution unless otherwise instructed.)

Sincerely - Ian

Ian Fairclough

Marion (Ohio) Public Library

Barbara Tillett, 20/11/2003, 15:08

Re: Component parts

I, too, am trying to locate a copy of Shoichi Taniguchi's JDOC article, but hopefully will find it today. There are components of the content (on the work/expression side) and components of the physical object (on the manifestation/item side) - I'll have to see if that is the sort of distinction Shoichi was making...

Work and expression are content.

Once that content is recorded in some carrier or container, you have a manifestation, and one copy of that manifestation is an item.

So to me, you can often have a situation where there is only one item (unique in the world - as with rare manuscripts) where even the single item, obviously, also is the only example of the manifestation that contains the single expression of that work (so in a sense they are all the "same" in that there is only one thing that contains all the entities). However, I would not use the term "identical" because we have identified specific attributes (data elements) that identify each of the FRBR entities, as well as relationships among the entities (within and among Groups 1, 2, and 3).

I can't see how you can have a work without an expression (you need to identify what mode/form of expression is being used to convey the ideas of the work). Gets back to attributes - at the expression level we identify the mode of expression and the language (when appropriate) used to convey the ideas of the work.

You can also have (and do in about 80% of OCLC's WorldCat database -based on OCLC research) the situation where there is only one manifestation (but multiple copies/"items" spread out all over the world) of the single expression of a single work (typical for scientific and engineering books) - so in a sense they are all the "same". But only by virtue of containing the same content. A manifestation is never "identical" to an expression, but would contain an expression, yet still having its own attributes for the carrier used for that particular manifestation.

There may also be situations where it simply makes no sense to try to parse out where a work ends and the single expression begins - (Patrick LeBoeuf's "workspression") and our systems should be able to accommodate such things.

There are also the complexities of works within works, whole/parts, and when we talk about these, we are more typically talking about the components of content (although in our fuzzy-speak, we also use the terms for the physical whole and parts of physical pieces, which is really the whole/parts of manifestations).

I'll let you know if reading Shoichi's article sheds more light on what Liv was introducing. - Barbara Tillett

Dr. Barbara B. Tillett, Ph.D.

Chief, Cataloging Policy and Support Office

FRBR Listserv Archive

Library of Congress

Liv Aasa Holm, 20/11/2003, 15:30

Re: Component parts

If I have understood correctly, the two types of component parts in Taniguchi's article are:

1. where all parts of the work is in one manifestation (content part)
2. where parts of the work are in different manifestations (different physical units) (document part).

The examples given are:

For (1) a music disc with several pieces

For (2) Library trends with its issues

For (1) there is no separate manifestation (real physical unit), but do we have to create manifestation records for the different pieces on the disc in order to store necessary data for each of them. Or more important, would it be wrong to create manifestation records for each part (of work and expression). After all we have ONE manifestation.

Perhaps a better example is a one-volume proceedings from a conference. The proceedings consists of several parts (content parts), but for each we might want to store title, statement of responsibility, number of pages etc. Those attributes belong at the manifestation level. Should we then regard the proceedings as a manifestation with several parts (whole-part relation on the manifestation level), although there would be one physical ITEM. I would prefer to use the whole-part relation on the manifestation level when the manifestation actually comes in several parts (physical parts).

I think we need both studies, examples and experience for this.

Liv A. Holm

Antony Gordon, 20/11/2003, 15:45

Re: Component parts

With regard to the music disc we have a work record for each piece, linked through a corresponding expression giving details of the performance and recording, which then link to the single manifestation (the disc) ... or have I missed something somewhere.

Antony Gordon

Cataloguer/Systems Administrator

British Library Sound Archive

Dan Matei, 20/11/2003, 16:39

Re: Component parts

> So to me, you can often have a situation where there is only
> one item (unique in the world - as with rare manuscripts)
> where even the single item, obviously, also is the only
> example of the manifestation that contains the single
> expression of that work (so in a sense they are all the
> "same" in that there is only one thing that contains all the
> entities). However, I would not use the term "identical"
> because we have identified specific attributes (data
> elements) that identify each of the FRBR entities, as well as
> relationships among the entities (within and among Groups 1,
> 2, and 3).

I fully agree. If I have a unique item, I can make the effort to imagine a "carbon copy" of it, and what the two share, "is" the manifestation.

> I can't see how you can have a work without an expression

> (you need to identify what mode/form of expression is being

> used to convey the ideas of the work). Gets back to

> attributes - at the expression level we identify the mode of

FRBR Listserv Archive

> expression and the language (when appropriate) used to convey
> the ideas of the work.

Yes again ! Last week in Paris (where you, Barbara, was missed !) I asked rhetorically: can we imagine an "un-expressed" work ? I.e. not realized ? But Beth Dulabahn said: yes, we can. A "forgotten" work, for instance (like Aristotle's "the Book on Laughing" ? :-). However, I guess, if the world recalls a work, I suppose it recalls also at least one of its expressions :-)

Dan

Barbara Tillett, 20/11/2003, 16:49

Re: Component parts

Absolutely right - I was responding to the context of work/manifestation without an expression, sorry I didn't make that clear.

You absolutely can have the work "ideas" in your head and never express them (and hence they would never have a manifestation). Your examples are excellent, thanks - Barbara

>>> "Göran Berntsson" <Goran.Berntsson@hb.se> 11/20/03 09:41AM >>>

Dear Barbara,

I'm just humbly reflecting on your remark:

>I can't see how you can have a work without an expression

I imagine a "work" as an idea before it is expressed and long before it is manifested. If I dwell on an idea of a novel, form it my head, think of a plot, make plans for a disposition ... and also have a title for my project, for my "work". Isn't there a work than without any expression?

Or if I plan for a work of art, a painting: I mix the colours, I examine my motif, I buy the canvas and make all planning for my "work" which is yet not created elsewhere than in my mind, where it already has its title. Isn't there a work before the expression?

Or shall we even go so far as to say: there is no work till there is a manifestation of it, that is until you can see something or/and keep it your hand?

Best wishes

Göran

Alan Danskin, 20/11/2003, 17:30

Re: Component parts

Perhaps we can only imagine an unexpressed work if the work is known to have existed, but the mode of expression is unknown. So in the case of the Aristotle work it is believed to have existed in various MSS (until the last one was burnt by the church :-)... However if a polymath, such as Leonardo da Vinci, referred to an otherwise unknown work only by title, we would have no way of telling whether he intended to express it in writing, paint or stone, or have I gone mad?

Alan

Barbara Tillett, 20/11/2003, 20:43

Re: Component parts

I am in the process of reading Taniguchi's article, but your description of 2) "documents", would imply that Taniguchi feels the manifestation must be a single physical unit, which isn't true. A specific manifestation can be in one or more physical parts - it's the whole package that is the manifestation - you may find, like with a book with an accompanying CD - the whole package is the manifestation, but it can be relative. If your library chooses to describe and house the CDs separately, you may want to consider describing the separate physical units and linking those descriptions. You have then chosen to consider the separate, independent components as separate but related manifestations.

We have a long history of experience with this already in our existing bibliographic records that represent manifestations. In the Anglo-American tradition, we have several options of how to treat manifestations that contain multiple works:

FRBR Listserv Archive

- We can catalog the manifestation that contains individual works in a single bibliographic record, in several ways:

- one bib record with or without contents notes and individual added entries for the citations for the contained works/parts (as we do for serials and integrating resources, most usually without contents notes; or for multipart works, sometimes with contents notes and sometimes with added entries) - there are obviously several permutations here, or

- one bib record with a "multilevel description" (AACR2, rule 13.6), or

- we can treat the components/parts as additions to the physical extent in the bibliographic description of the whole (as we do for some accompanying or dependent supplementary materials).

- We can catalog the individual works in separate bibliographic records

- such as for "analytics" and "In analytics" (using series statements and/or added entries to relate the parts to the "whole"), or

- for the related works over time (connecting these "parts" with added entries or the links we use to connect earlier and later titles of a serial when we use successive entries).

We have found each of these methods useful in specific situations.

Cataloging has always had to factor in the economics of creating bibliographic records and the cost of related authority work that is needed when identifying and providing an authorized heading for the specific component works. We cannot afford to always describe and identify every work although that may be the "ideal" - (sometimes leaving such levels to abstracting and indexing services, sometimes to bibliographies, finding aids, and other reference tools). - Barbara

Dan Matei, 20/11/2003, 22:03

Re: Component parts

Ok, ok. We can imagine a work out of which only the title survived. But, in this case, why would we make a record in a catalogue for it ? As a topic, maybe. Ok. But imagine now that someone is building a discourse about a work without knowing it was a text, a song or a painting. Unless making an essay about how pity it disappeared, or that probably it was boring, or what Plato thought it ment to the Greeks, etc. In this case I would catalogue-it as a concept, not as a work :-).

Anyway, this seems a funny Byzantine discussion to me :-)

Dan

Dan Matei, 20/11/2003, 22:12

Re: Component parts

> I imagine a "work" as an idea before it is expressed and long before it
> is manifested.

> If I dwell on an idea of a novel, form it my head, think of a plot,

> make plans for a disposition ... and also have a title for my project,

> for my "work". Isn't there a work than without any expression?

Yes, it is a work, but you already have an expression also in your head: you called it "novel". If my English is not fooling me, that means a "text", no ? :-)

Moreover, if you want your work in my catalogue, you have to tell me something about it, beside the title. You will tell me at least the basic idea, such as "boy meets girl". I will detect an expression here :-)

> Or if I plan for a work of art, a painting: I mix the colours, I

> examine my motif, I buy the canvas and make all planning for my "work"

> which is yet not created elsewhere than in my mind, where it already

> has its title.

> Isn't there a work before the expression?

Yes, it is. But again, in its way toward my catalogue it will build itself a realization, i.e. an expression.

Or not ?

> Or shall we even go so far as to say: there is no work till there is a

> manifestation of it, that is until you can see something or/and keep it

> your hand?

FRBR Listserv Archive

Not necessarily tangible: a performance, for instance.
Dan

Liv Aasa Holm, 21/11/2003, 08:27
Re: Component parts

Of course a manifestation may be in many parts, that is not the issue, as far as I have understood. My formulation was not good. I will try again.

- content part is part of a Work where the Expression is manifested in one Manifestation. As is the case for a piece of music on a single disc
- document part is part of a work which is manifested separately. As is the case with a special issue of a series/periodical.

The division of component parts in these two groups are interesting for comparing then FRBR-model with Taniguchi's model. It is also interesting for understanding the FRBR model.

In working with both models we have had (and will have) interesting discussions concerning how to implement FRBR, how to (if necessary) improve FRBR.
Expressions

I agree with Dan and others that it is difficult (or not really worth while) to have a Work without an Expression. But is this also true for part of a Work?

You have the whole Work. The whole Work consists of, let's say 6 parts. You have an Expression of the Work. You want descriptions of each part (for better retrieval), but do you need part-expressions for each part of the Work? Or better: do you need Expression RECORDS (part expression) in the database? Or may the Expression record for the whole Work be valid for each part of the Work as well? I am not thinking som much on cataloguing rules and practice here as of the datamodel and the search and retrieval programs.

As Barbara wrote, libraries have always handled these situations, and in different ways according to needs and available resources.

To me all this is therefore more a datamodelling question and a question of how to improve retrieval from the databases.

Liv

Göran Berntsson, 21/11/2003, 08:28
Re: Component parts

>>> "Dan Matei" <Dan@cimec.ro> 2003-11-20 22:12:47 >>>

> I imagine a "work" as an idea before it is expressed and long before it
> is manifested.

> If I dwell on an idea of a novel, form it my head, think of a plot,
> make plans for a disposition ... and also have a title for my project,
> for my "work". Isn't there a work than without an expression?

Yes, it is a work, but you already have an expression also in your head: you called it "novel". If my English is not fooling me, that means a "text", no ? :-)

Again a little hard to distinguish *work* from *expression* here! Seems there are works anyway that don't fit the catalogue.

If the poet chooses to learn his lyrics by heart and never expresses them in any other way than reading them aloud for himself when walking alone in the deep woods Is it in any way meaningful to use the word "expression" for this work of his? And what is the manifestation? The sound-waves? Nothing for the catalogue anyway. Not till we have technical facilities yet unknown : -)

Göran

Miriam Nauri, 21/11/2003, 09:28
Re: Component parts

I do not think that one can use the FRBR-model to describe the ideas in the head of a person. The old notion that the "idea" of an author can be said to be transparently transmitted in a text has been discussed (and rejected!) within literary theory

FRBR Listserv Archive

throughout the past century. When FRBR defines a "work" as being "a distinct intellectual or artistic creation" one wonders who the judge of the level of distinctness should be. Surely it cannot be the author! An alternative view is then that a "work" is what the vast majority of readers would perceive as originating from the same artistic idea.

If the definition of a work is dependent on there being readers (which i think it should be in a model that is to be used for describing library material), then there is indeed no work without an item.

Miriam Nauri

Martin Doerr, 21/11/2003, 13:56

Re: Component parts

Dear All,

My point of view of parts of manifestation is:

A) An item, example (or instance) of the Manifestation is a unit defined by functional unity: All components for the intended function should be together, such a book and CD, book and map etc. It could even be a folder with leaves. Mechanical coherence is not relevant from a library perspective.

B) All real things can be subdivided in parts by various criteria.

My point of view about work:

Without defining the identity of a work, no discussion is possible. Let's assume work is the unit as originally conceived by the creator:

Then studies, drawings, molds, etc., as e.g. all items that have come upon us from Rodin's Door of the Hell, could be seen as expressions of parts of that work. It may not be finished, as Gaudi's Sagrada Familia in Barcelona. In that sense, yes, the existence of the whole work is evident from parts without an expression of the whole. Some expressions can be identified with parts, some not, e.g. a overall drawing from one perspective.

Let's assume Richard Smiraglia's point of view of a work as something that can be taken up and become a symbol in society. Then the question does not exist, because expression is fundamentally different from work. A work does not consist of 6 parts. It acquires more and more parts and stages over time. Those parts are spatiotemporal in their existence, and distinct from the parts fixed at a certain time by a certain expression.

As a complete outsider, once FRBR has identified the levels of work and expression, I do not understand why the necessity to document those is discussed before and agreement on their very nature and identity.

Best,
Martin

Martin Doerr, 21/11/2003, 14:08

Re: Component parts

Miriam Nauri wrote:

> I do not think that one can use the FRBR-model to describe the ideas in
> the head of a person. The old notion that the "idea" of an author can be
> said to be transparently transmitted in a text has been discussed (and
> rejected!) within literary theory throughout the past century. When FRBR
> defines a "work" as being "a distinct intellectual or artistic creation"
> one wonders who the judge of the level of distinctness should be. Surely
> it cannot be the author! An alternative view is then that a "work" is
> what the vast majority of readers would perceive as originating from the
> same artistic idea.

> If the definition of a work is dependent on there being readers (which i
> think it should be in a model that is to be used for describing library
> material), then there is indeed no work without an item.

I agree. Of course we cannot talk about anything without evidence, and of course we document only relevant things. But that does not mean, that a work can become

FRBR Listserv Archive

culturally relevant by incomplete products. Hence work cannot be identified by the items, even though at least one item must exist.

I would also hesitate to base a notion for documenting work on the original idea of a creator. I'd argue that this is hard to grasp and less relevant to the reader as all the take-up of the idea. The initial idea may even long be lost as with Grimm's tales. In these cases, I'd be interested in all interpretations over time, translations etc.

Martin

Matthew Beacom, 21/11/2003, 15:45

Re: Component parts

Dan, all,

The way I think of the WEMI model, Works and Expressions have neither a separate nor a prior existence relative to the intellectual or artistic things that have been produced. In short, there is no work or expression without a manifestation. In the FRBR conceptual model, Works and Expressions are abstractions about the intellectual or artistic content manifest in the things we use and collect. We use these abstractions to help us understand, organize, and use things with intellectual or artistic content because they help us understand certain aspects of the content that is manifest in the objects we have.

Works and expressions are not thoughts in an artist's mind prior to creating something. They are not in the FRBR model some potentiality that is later realized. The FRBR model is a model for controlling things with intellectual or artistic content and the terms have their meaning in that context. The English words--Work, Expression, etc.--in other contexts could be used to understand the process of creating things with intellectual or artistic content.. I think that has been a source of some confusion in understanding and applying the FRBR model. I repeat, the FRBR model is a model for controlling things with intellectual or artistic content. The FRBR conceptual model is useful only when we have some artifact, some thing, with content. The FRBR model does not apply to creative processes any more than it applies to inventory control for such things as reams of blank paper or stacks of blank CDs.

Matthew Beacom

Martin Doerr, 21/11/2003, 16:26

Re: Component parts

Dear Dan, dear All,

Following the discussion in Paris, I think you cannot create another item of a manifestation with one unique item only by copying. That violates the identity of the manifestation as we had discussed, which was based on the features intended by the editor, that relate to the intended functionality of the product (to be read, to be played etc.).

We had agreed that manuscripts are always unique.

Each copy method would capture other features. Therefore only resuming the production process can produce another item, as the recasting of the mermaid in Copenhagen.

The copy shares the expression, not the manifestation, depending on the definition of the expression. It may share part of the expression, e.g. loose the colours of the images.

I suggest it would be helpful to register all the cases discussed on this list and discuss them in terms of the identity assumptions each contributor seems to have. I think these must be made explicit, in order the discussion to become more effective.

Best,

Martin

Liv Aasa Holm, 24/11/2003, 13:18

Re: Component parts

So we are back at the question: What is a Work.

What you say is that a disc is just an assembly of many Expressions of different Works. If this is always the case, it would be easier to model this.

FRBR Listserv Archive

What you say about sound recording, may also be valid for a printed "something". But then again, somebody may have been creative (the creator of) the assembly of pieces on the disc. Does that make the selection a Work? If the selection, that is, has a meaning beyond just publish the individual pieces?

And what if the pieces on the disc are parts of something bigger. Each part may be seen as a Work by itself, but it belongs to a higher unit. What do we do then? Is the Peer Gynt suite an example here?

Liv A. Holm

Antony Gordon, 24/11/2003, 15:49

Re: Component parts

Well, for what it's worth I would say that is a collection that has a collection title. If I was cataloguing it I would probably create a manifestation level record to represent the whole set, describing its extent and adding individual disc titles for additional access to each disc. My understanding of a Work is that it is an abstraction created by cataloguers (and effectively by users also) to describe artistic works (in the broadest sense) that have multiple expressions, already or potentially. So, eight Vivaldi works, eight Ravel works, eight Gershwin works ... each with an associated expression. This kind of massive compilation almost always contains mostly or even exclusively recordings (expressions) that have been published previously in other manifestations - often many times and possibly over several decades. Clearly we need to be able link such expressions together wherever possible to save the time of the user (paraphrasing Ranganathan slightly) so that s/he doesn't end up retrieving the same item on different media under the mistaken impression that they are actually different. So returning to the original point I can't see that it would serve anybody to describe the collection here as a Work unless we are to set up a new sideline in obfuscation!

Ag :-)

Victoria Francu, 24/11/2003, 14:44

Re: Component parts

I'm sorry I've made a mistake.

This is the way this line should read:

Vol. 30 has G. Gershwin - Rhapsody in Blue on the cover and includes 8 different pieces, of which Gershwin's is the last

My apologies,

V.

Victoria Francu

Central University Library

1, Boteanu Street

Bucharest - Sector 1

Romania

Victoria Francu, 24/11/2003, 14:19

Re: Component parts

When I mentioned music discs I had in mind an example of a 30 disc collection entitled "Les grands classiques d'or".

As I am not a specialist in cataloguing musical works I was astonished by the imagination that music publisher used when he grouped the sound recordings on the 30 volumes of classical music. I'll give you some examples:

- Vol. 1 has A. Vivaldi - Les quatre saisons - Le Printemps on the cover and includes 8 pieces, of which Vivaldi's is the first;

- Vol. 29 has M. Ravel - Bolero on the cover and includes 8 different pieces, of which Ravel's is the first;

- Vol. 30 has G. Gershwin - Rhapsody in Blue on the cover and includes 8 different pieces, of which Ravel's is the last.

FRBR Listserv Archive

The question arises: do we have here a multilevel work entitled "Les grands classiques d'or" as parent work? Or is this just a collection title given by the publisher? Which level comes next? Do we have an intermediary level between the parent work and the individual pieces (expressions of different works) on each of the 30 volumes? I doubt that. I'm afraid there is some analogy here between books and music when the title of the selection is the title of one piece.

Furthermore, each volume has its own physical support therefore is considered as a manifestation. So each must be treated as the manifestation of a work. What sort of relation is then between the work giving the volume title and the separate individual pieces on each volume?

Can anyone bring some light in this blind alley?

Victoria

Victoria Frâncu

Central University Library

1, Boteanu Street

Bucharest - Sector 1

Romania

Victoria Francu, 25/11/2003, 07:35

Re: Component parts

It would be nice and easy to be so if it were not for the compilation of each of the 30 discs: on each volume there are different composers and their works and one of them is giving the title of the disc i.e. Vivaldi for Vol. 1, ... Ravel for Vol. 29 and Gershwin for Vol. 30. This does not change much the situation (for they are still expressions, no matter whether they are all Vivaldi, all Ravel a.s.o. or pieces belonging to various composers) but the kind of relationship is what I was interested about.

But, thank you very much for clearing the way.

Victoria

Antony Gordon, 24/11/2003, 13:05

Re: Component parts

I'm a little worried that some of this discussion has seemed to imply the existence of a Work that represents the entire contents of a music disc and that the individual Works on that disc add further complications. I think we need here to get away from any idea that music discs are like books. In the world of sound recordings, as we all know, it is not at all unusual for a group of recordings (of individual Works) to be issued on a particular disc and subsequently reissued, perhaps many times, either in the same grouping, or broken down and assembled with other recordings as new groupings.

If we attempt to treat each of these packages as some kind of diffuse Work then we will surely lead ourselves and our users up a blind alley. Let me try a concrete example. If I have a disc in front of me that contains two Schumann song cycles: Dichterliebe, and Frauenliebe und Leben, together with say two other songs as filler items, then we have just four Works, one for each of the cycles and one for each of the individual songs. The collection as a whole is not a Work since the process of assemblage occurs at the manifestation level and results not from a composer's intentions nor probably even a performer's intentions but rather from a marketing decision.

Each of these four Works is expressed through a particular recording and the sum total of the four expressions is manifested on a particular CD as issued. Let us say that the following year, following rave reviews of the Dichterliebe, that the company decides to reissue but in the knowledge that the Frauenliebe und Leben was not well liked. They are likely to change the programme on the disc, placing the Dichterliebe together with perhaps some further recordings of individual songs or maybe a well regarded set of Wolf Lieder by the same artist that has previously been issued on another disc. Specific information that enables the particular assemblage to be traced e.g. 'Fischer-Dieskau sings Schubert' or 'Fischer-Dieskau's greatest hits' belongs as Manifestation-level title. The closest analogy for books would probably be a

FRBR Listserv Archive

compilation of short stories in which they are juxtaposed more by accident of publication than a particular artistic intent on the part of the author and quite possibly given a collection title by the publisher.

Ag
Antony Gordon

Victoria Frâncu, 24/11/2003, 10:16
Re: Component parts

Dear All,

I am sorry for not being "present" last week in the vivid discussion on component parts. After a comprehensive reading of the many messages on this issue here are some comments:

According to the FRBR report the entities defined for the FRBR study represent key objects of interest to users of bibliographic data (cf. 3.1 Overview). The first group of entities comprises the products of intellectual or artistic endeavour that are named or described in bibliographic records: WEMI. A bibliographic record is defined as the aggregate of data associated with entities described in library catalogues and national libraries (cf. Scope). The FRBR have been created to organise library material such a way to permit the user to find, identify, select and obtain the entities described according to his needs. So, we cannot talk here about things that do not exist such as somebody's idea of a novel , a musical work or a painting. We can't speak about library material unless there is a record of that material.

In fact this discussion is the side effect of the critical issue of the existence of a work without expression. The multipart works are real problems particularly when we deal with more than one content parts like individual papers in a book of proceedings, festschrifts or individual musical pieces on a music disc at the work-expression level. In order to have data on each of these parts of works in our catalogue we need to treat - say - each of the participant papers as separate works and expressions although one attribute that has to be considered is the existence of a carrier in our case the same in all separate works. On the one hand we have one manifestation as a carrier or container of several separate works-expressions holding a part/whole relationship with the parent work. On the other hand it is the parent work that has that manifestation and not each separate parts.

Certainly what is needed here is instructions on the treatment of such material in order to avoid redundancy. (The problem of identity between work, expression and manifestation is posed in the case of bibliographic records for "unicellular families" (see Patrick LeBoeuf at: http://www.stk.cz/elag2001/Papers/PatrickLe_Boeuf/PatrickLe_Boeuf.html).

Yet we have to state our priorities: does it make sense to disseminate data on what is held in our collections or should we go on making contents notes on the component parts at the expense of poor representation of data in our catalogues with all its consequences on the user's side?

Victoria

Morbus Iff, 07/01/2004, 22:10
Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

Good day all. I'm a new subscriber, working on an as-yet-unannounced open source project based on FRBR. I'm new to FRBR, and I've some questions concerning your feelings, thoughts, and (possibly) in-use techniques.

I want to FRBRize movies, where carrier doesn't matter. The amount of data I'd like to catalog is analogous to the IMDB: as much as possible, with a minimal of five (top-billed or not) cast members of the movie.

Question: what do you call a "movie"? To say I want to "index movies" immediately restricts me to merely movies - it leaves out documentaries, television series, cartoons, broadcasts of events (the Oscar's, etc.). Similarly, "film" is not perfect, because you have "digital video" elements that have never seen celluloid at all. "Video", perhaps, is the most applicable, though it seems to give off a taint of the

FRBR Listserv Archive

ancients: "video is dead, long live DVDs". So, what do you collectively call movies, documentaries, cartoons, and TV shows?

Question: is anyone actually indexing movies? Is anyone then providing that data for public use? My initial reason for joining the list was to scour the archives for answers, but the helpful moderators/owners pointed me to the following document concerning the ECHO Metadata implementation:

<http://pc-erato2.iei.pi.cnr.it/echo/public/deliv/D3-1-1%20ECHO%20Metadata%20Modelling.pdf>

where it breaks down (loosely transcribed from p13):

W: 2001: A space odyssey

E1: The film "2001: A space odyssey" by Stanley Kubrick

M1: The 35 mm format

M2: The DVD from Paramount (or wherever).

I1: The one I own, located in box 17.

Should expressions always contain the director? Should "the film" be replaced with "the tv series", "the documentary", "the cartoon", etc.?

Question: is anyone, movie or not, cataloging Character, which presumably have the same information as a Person? If you are, how are you distinguishing Corporate Body's from fictional bodies? How are you distinguishing a Person who is playing a Character that is based on a real Person? I'd love to be able to say "show me all the items I have that haveCharacter Sherlock Holmes".

For now, that's it. Don't want to overstay my welcome with a 15k email. ;)

--

Morbus Iff

Martha M. Yee, 09/01/2004, 03:09

Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

See below for a few answers to your questions from the point of view of a motion picture archive cataloger: (preceded by ***)

[...] So, what do you collectively call movies, documentaries, cartoons, and TV shows?

***We have used the term moving image to cover all images that move (rather than being still) in our cataloging standards work in the United States, but this is probably not a term familiar to the man on the street...

Question: is anyone actually indexing movies? Is anyone then providing that data for public use?

***Not sure how you are using the term "indexing," but we provide lots of subject and genre access to the films and television programs held by the UCLA Film and Television Archive at: <http://orion2.library.ucla.edu>

***Just be sure to select our "database" every time you do a search, or you will be searching the books in the research library by default...

[...] concerning the ECHO Metadata implementation [...] where it breaks down (loosely transcribed from p13):

W: 2001: A space odyssey

E1: The film "2001: A space odyssey" by Stanley Kubrick

M1: The 35 mm format

M2: The DVD from Paramount (or wherever).

I1: The one I own, located in box 17.

***If you look at FRBR itself, the work (W) would be the film 2001: a space odyssey; Arthur C. Clarke's original short story (Sentinel) would be a related work, as would Clarke's 1999 science fiction novel that came out after the film. An example of an expression of the film might be a DVD version with an audio commentary by Kubrick or some such...

***In our catalog, we use work authority records to represent the work, separate bibliographic records for each expression, and MARC holdings records attached to the bibliographic record for each manifestation of a particular expression of a particular

FRBR Listserv Archive

work. Related works are linked by using the main entry for the related work as an added entry on the work being cataloged and related to it.

[...] I'd love to be able to say "show me all the items I have that haveCharacter Sherlock Holmes".

***Take a look at our catalog; select Power search, subject index, and type 'Holmes' in the search box; then click on either 'browse' or 'headings.' (The first will do a left-to-right match; the second will to a keyword in heading search.)

***Martha Yee

Morbus Iff, 09/01/2004, 20:15

Re: FRBR Shared Data and "Judge for Yourself"

In reading over the archives, there's a definite and spoken assumption that some aspects of FRBR "are left up to the cataloguer" (for brevity's sake, "judge for yourself"). This, naturally, can occur in other forms of cataloging too: the decision, for example, to include supporting cast members of a movie in varying fields of MARC. However, MARC isn't relational or hierarchic: each record can "stand alone" without needing to step on any other MARC record's toes. This is wildly different than FRBR, where one of the goals is to take a creation and splice it amongst work, expression, manifestation, and item, each of which are explicitly related to each other or other elements in another record's hierarchy.

How this FRBR hierarchy breaks down is itself a "judge for yourself", indicated by the length of the "is it a new expression?" discussion in the archives. What you may consider a new expression, I may not think worth it; what you consider a manifestation could be my new expression, and so on and so forth.

This, along with "judge for yourself" seems to throw a giant wrench in the easy sharing and propagation of catalogued data we've grown use to with MARC records.

Let's face it: whether you include cast members in MARC WILL NOT greatly affect my decision *or eventual display* of the data within that MARC record - MARC records are "flat" and carry no implicit relationships (save for those based on raw data like authority).

On the other hand, if you catalog something as an FRBR expression, and I catalog it as a different manifestation, we've got problems: the *display* of the data is affected (as the hierarchy has now changed), along with the *relationships* we can infer between other works, expressions, and manifestations.

This seems really bad - how are we gonna share like we're used to?

Are we "doomed" to continue to use MARC as "base data"? Will FRBR remain only an "end-user" technology, a highly personalized "as we think our users benefit" determination (to be fair, a core goal of the actual whitepaper)? Is anyone sharing FRBR data with anyone else? What happens when hierarchies clash?

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 12/01/2004, 20:19

Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

I'm not sure I agree with your suggestion for expression: by suggesting that a DVD is an expression, you're bring the physicality of a manifest into that of an expression. If we take FRBR strictly, ignoring the ECHO project, it seems we'd get something more like:

W1: 2001: A space odyssey (film)

E1: 2001: A space odyssey (directed by Stanley Kubrick)

M1: The DVD from Paramount (or wherever).

I1: The one I own, located in box 17.

Thoughts?

Morbus Iff

Göran Berntsson, 12/01/2004, 20:54

Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

FRBR Listserv Archive

OK for your M1, no doubt about it.
But who is the author of your W1?
In fact I meet the old difficulty here, how to separate W from E.
Do you mean there is a film (W1) *without* the direction of Kubrick?
/Göran

Gerhard Riesthuis, 12/01/2004, 21:02
Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

Dear all,

In my opinion the DVD is a manifestation containing an expression of the film. The fact that the DVD in many cases has some extras does change this. It just means that the DVD also contains expressions of other works, in most cases related to the original film.
What are the thoughts about this?
Gerhard Riesthuis

Göran Berntsson, 12/01/2004, 21:14
Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

Indeed, this is why I liked the ECHO's way of doing things. With their breakdown, I could:

- W1: Friday The 13th
- E1: Friday The 13th (the film)
- E2: Friday The 13th (the comic)
- E3: Friday The 13th (the tv series)

Doing it with:

W1: 2001: A space odyssey (the film directed by Stanley Kubrick)
also makes a lot of sense to me (with related Works of his writings), but I feel a huge blank when it comes to Expression, as you've suggested. I'm not sure which direction to take: I'd rather err on the side of "easier to fix six months down the road when I have 15,000 movies". But, which would that be? ;)
>Do you mean there is a film (W1) *without* the direction of Kubrick?
But couldn't there be, one day? America loves to remake stuff.
Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 12/01/2004, 21:18
Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

>In my opinion the DVD is a manifestation containing an expression of the
>film. The fact that the DVD in many cases has some extras does change this.
So, how would you define this? There are three currently suggested:

- ECHO:
- W: 2001: A space odyssey
 - E1: The film "2001: A space odyssey" by Stanley Kubrick
 - M1: The 35 mm format
 - M2: The DVD from Paramount (or wherever).
 - I1: The one I own, located in box 17.

Martha M. Yee:

If you look at FRBR itself, the work (W) would be the film 2001: a space odyssey; Arthur C. Clarke's original short story (Sentinel) would be a related work, as would Clarke's 1999 science fiction novel that came out after the film. An example of an expression of the film might be a DVD version with an audio commentary by Kubrick or some such...

My meandering:

- W1: 2001: A space odyssey (film)
- E1: 2001: A space odyssey (directed by Stanley Kubrick)
- M1: The DVD from Paramount (or wherever).
- I1: The one I own, located in box 17.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 12/01/2004, 23:42

Re: Movies and FRBR - What Approach?

I think I'm going to end up going with my approach:

W1: Texas chainsaw massacre (film)

E1: Texas chainsaw massacre (original; directed by Tobe Hooper)

M1: The VHS from Paramount (or wherever).

M2: The special edition DVD from Paramount.

E2: Texas chainsaw massacre (remake; directed by some other guy)

M1: The DVD from New Line.

W1: Texas chainsaw massacre (comics)

E1: Texas chainsaw massacre (written by person).

etc., etc. Any thoughts on this? The one downside, as mentioned previously, is the lack of authority for the Work, but I can't think of any immediate way that would remove the seeming duplication of the Expression:

W1: Texas chainsaw massacre (directed by Tobe Hooper)

E1: Texas chainsaw massacre (directed by Tobe Hooper)

E2: Texas chainsaw massacre (remake; directed by some other guy)

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 12/01/2004, 23:46

Re: Movies and FRBR - What Approach?

> W1: Texas chainsaw massacre (directed by Tobe Hooper)

> E1: Texas chainsaw massacre (directed by Tobe Hooper)

> E2: Texas chainsaw massacre (remake; directed by some other guy)

Actually, a thought.

In the realm of movies, perhaps, is the writer/director a decent schism for authority? That'd give some ability to distinguish W/E:

W1: Texas chainsaw massacre (written by PERSON1)

E1: Texas chainsaw massacre (original, directed by PERSON2)

E2: Texas chainsaw massacre (remake, directed by PERSON3)

Granted, some writer's are their own directors, but this does bring a clearer definition of the evolution from "intellectual or artistic creation" (ie., the words that make up a movie script) to the realization of this work (the final movie itself). I'll let it bounce in my head some more, but this seems even clearer.

Morbus Iff

Dan Matei, 13/01/2004, 09:27

Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

I beg to disagree.

Again: the reification of the work is done for collocation purposes in the catalogue, not for deep, analytical, cultural, doctoral, metaphysical reasons. However, we should take into account the "cultural identity" of a work in the mind of the catalogue's users, in order to be "recognized" by them.

So: "2001: A Space Odyssey" IS the Kubrick's film (same as Hamlet is Shakespeare's Hamlet). At least in the Western culture, the film is attributed - mainly - to the director. In this case we call it Kubrick's A Space Odyssey, no ?

So:

W1: 2001: A space odyssey (Stanley Kubrick's film)

E1: 2001: A space odyssey (original version)

M1: The DVD from Paramount (or wherever).

I1: The one you own, located in box 17.

E2: (say) 2001: Une odysee spatiale (?) (version subtitled in French)

M1: (say) The videotape from Vivendi :-)

I1: the one I do not own, located in your box 18

Dan Matei

FRBR Listserv Archive

Morbus Iff, 13/01/2004, 13:52

Re: Movies, Casting, and Characters?

Fair enough, but what about movies that have no cultural significance to anyone but fans? How would FRIDAY THE 13th be attributed? SPIDER BABY? 2001: A SPACE ODYSSEY is "easy" (but, I currently disagree with my own meanderings above too, so ignore that one). How do you feel about the writer/director schism, which seems to fall more closely with FRBR as written?

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 14/01/2004, 06:41

Re: Defining Slices Of An Expression? Parts? Expressionettes?

CCing to the FRBR list...

>Re: the schema, this may not be terribly relevant to movies (though it
>could be depending on one's needs), but one thing I don't see (am I
>just missing it?) is a way to represent parts.

>Example: I want to represent a scene in a movie, or an article in a
>periodical, complete with extent identifiers (a time range for the
>first, and maybe standard volume, issue, date, page numbers for the
I can certainly see this being relevant from an FRBR point of view. One of the big things of FRBR is relationships: how an expression (a movie) is related to its manifestation (a DVD), how an expression (a movie) is related to its work (the shooting script) and so forth. But, I can rattle off, and I'm sure a lot of other people can too, movies (expressions) that contain scenes of other expressions (movies - am I flipflopping too much?).

For instance, there's one entire scene ripped from POISON that is shown in FINAL EXAMINATION. Having something more than just a generic "note" would be helpful, especially when the same scene is repeated a number of times (most notably, car explosions used in Lloyd Kaufman and Roger Corman flicks; "show me all movies that contain this expression[ette]").

I'm not sure how to properly represent this within FRBR - at most, portions of an expression (a paragraph, an article, a slice of time) would be related to another expression (E1 containsPartOf E2; E2 hasPartAppearingIn E1), but that still (at least, in the current schema) doesn't give us extent and other helpful info.

From a schema point of view, I could see a new "expressionette" mini-entity (/database table) that could segregate a unique expression (note, that an expressionette would NOT break apart things that are already separate expressions, like a DVD and its liner notes, or an English book and its study guide).

So, something like:

E1: Final examination (directed by some guy)

EN1: 23:45 - 24:15, swimming pool dive by Kari Wuhrer

Relationship: EN1 PartAppearsIn E2.

E2: Poison (directed by some guy)

Relationship: EN2 containsPart EN1.

Thoughts?

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 14/01/2004, 13:45

Re: Defining Slices Of An Expression? Parts? Expressionettes?

>I'm not sure how to properly represent this within FRBR - at most,
>portions of an expression (a paragraph, an article, a slice of time)
>would be related to another expression (E1 containsPartOf E2; E2
>hasPartAppearingIn E1), but that still (at least, in the current
>schema) doesn't give us extent and other helpful info.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Incidentally, in thinking of this last night, these shouldn't be based around the expression ("movie"), but rather manifestations ("dvd", "vhs"). A different cut of the movie often appears on the DVD compared to the tape, so the timestamps/extent will be different.

Morbus Iff

Gerhard Riesthuis, 14/01/2004, 21:23

Re: Defining Slices Of An Expression? Parts? Expressionettes?

But are two different cuts of the same film (= same work) not two different expressions? If one of these cuts is on DVD, and the other on VHS tape then we have in my opinion two expressions each on its own manifestation.

Gerhard Riesthuis

Morbus Iff, 14/01/2004, 21:30

Re: Manifestation/Responsibility

Looking at the cover to this manifestation:

<http://images.amazon.com/images/P/B00006FD94.01.LZZZZZZZ.jpg>

is there a statement of responsibility? The nearest I can see is "Artisan Home Entertainment". Would you use that, or go "inside" the movie credits and pick out the director, even though he's not (in this case), "in conjunction with the title"?

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 14/01/2004, 21:33

Re: Defining Slices Of An Expression? Parts? Expressionettes?

Well, I'm not talking about different cuts of the SAME film, I'm talking about scenes from FILM A being duplicated in a totally different FILM B. How would you represent that not only as a relationship, but also more fully, with extents, annotations, etc.

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 14/01/2004, 22:36

Re: Movies/NTSC Equivalent To Books/Large Print?

Large prints in books: expression or manifestation? NTSC conversion of movies: expression or manifestation?

Assuming, for the sake of conversational brevity:

- * the normal print book is letter-for-letter the same as the large print book.

- * an NTSC movie is the frame-for-frame the same as an American version, but shorter.

Should they be split as different expressions or manifestations?

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 15/01/2004, 02:47

Re: FRBR, MySQL Data Model, Group 1 Mapped, Comments?

Hey there. One reason I joined the FRBR list is because I'm working on some software that tries to represent FRBR in a data model. Whereas it would handily be represented in RDF, my "user profile" requirements for this project force me to cater to the lowest common denominator, being MySQL or PostgreSQL. As such, I've been working on a MySQL schema for "normal, non-RDF folk". You can see the Project Goals for the software here:

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/>

FRBR Listserv Archive

Currently, everything is very, very rough, and the DatabaseSchema that is currently available is out of date. This email is about the current versions of the SQL schema, which covers just Group 1 Entities, as well as their relationships amongst each other. The data involved is film, so one movie has been marked up in this way as an experiment.

I need comments. I'll be starting Group 2 (person and corporate body, probably the most time consuming of this process) sometime tomorrow. There are two files I'm interested in having you take a look at (which I can attach if necessary):

<http://cvs.sourceforge.net/viewcvs.py/libdb/LibDB/databases/>

WARNING! Be sure you're looking at Rev 1.5 (which should be there shortly, compensating for the lag of the web cvs servers). mysql_sample.sql is a "real world" mapping of a movie entitled THE POOL, and mysql_schema.sql is the database schema that describes it.

To truly understand what's going on here, you should:

- * have a background in relational database programming.
- * be able to read and understand SQL from the schema and data.

If you don't, these files won't be useful to you - I've plans to write a more concise, verbose, and friendly article about all this once I get a closer idea of how more data maps, and so forth.

If you're still here, some specific areas to look at are the relationships defined. In the current schema, there are (at the bottom), six relationships defined; three come from FRBR and are well-defined:

```
$work          is realized through  $expression
$expression    is a realization of  $work

$expression    is embodied in      $manifestation
$manifestation is an embodiment of $expression

$manifestation is exemplified by  $item
$item          is an exemplar of  $manifestation
```

You can tell this is a hierarchy. However, three relationships were defined explicitly by me to cover some of the attributes of the various FRBR entities. That's what I need sanity checking on (both in the terms used to link the relationship, and in the actual SQL implementation and layout):

```
$entity        is also named      $name
$name          is a variant name of $entity

$entity        is summarized with $annotation
$annotation    is a summarization of $entity

$annotation    is summarized by   $entity
$entity        is a summarizer of  $annotation
```

The last two relationships can be used validly to say:

```
"THE POOL is summarized with [this annotation]";
```

```
"[This annotation] is summarized by [this author]";
```

but, in the sample data, the summarization actually comes from the back of the DVD. So, in essence, another example is:

```
"THE POOL is summarized with [this annotation]";
```

```
"[This annotation] is summarized by [the DVD manifestation]";
```

Thoughts?
Morbus Iff

Martin Doerr, 15/01/2004, 13:10

Re: Movies/NTSC Equivalent To Books/Large Print?

To my understanding, "expression" is a concept devised to be used to find

a) alternative manifestations, that a user might use and that fulfil for him individually the same function, e.g.

al) rendering objective/ scientific/

FRBR Listserv Archive

a2) scholarly information
a3) rendering an intellectual construct such as a fiction
a4) rendering an aesthetic experience
a5) decorative or demonstrative function (such as showing an educated book shelf...)

b) comparable manifestations with the same "content", for
b1) bibliographic/biographic studies
b2) market analysis

Obviously, for each of the above function, other variations in the immaterial contents are crucial for the question, if it is the same. In other words, the features that are responsible for the identity of an expression, which is an abstraction over a continuum of variations of real things, depend ultimately on the selected function.

Let us take a1):

Words and illustrations must be the same. Lay-out and type-face is irrelevant. A good translation is in general equivalent.

Let us take a2):

Words and illustrations must be the same. Lay-out and type-face is irrelevant. Even a good translation is in general NOT equivalent, e.g. in case of a philosophical text.

Let us take a3):

Words must be the same. Secondary illustrations might be irrelevant. Even a good translation is in general NOT equivalent.

etc.

I think this should be enough to demonstrate, that the questions as below cannot be answered. To my opinion this holds for the majority of similar messages on this list. The questions could be answered in that way, if this community had a common, well documented and well-justified opinion on which of the above functions determines the notion of "Expression".

In my opinion:

* The discussion on this list proves, that there is no such common understanding.

* This discussion can only make progress, and the notions of "Expression" and "Work" can only be transferred to a reasonable cataloguing practice, if these functions are made explicit in this discussion.

* It seems to be necessary, to distinguish between different types of expressions, with different identity criteria. Possibly one type might imply another in a kind of derivation hierarchy.

* It might be feasible, to tie genre to a most relevant function, as suggested in my examples.

* It is definitely not feasible to find a "maximal" distinction, as I see frequently on this list, which, in case of doubt, regards two expressions as different. To stress the differences instead of the commonalities is completely opposite to the intended function, i.e. to find alternative manifestations. In that case, the maximal distinction is the Manifestation level, there is no Expression, and me as a user I am still lost to find Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity.

In answer to the below:

For me (as a book consumer), the large print and the normal print embodies the same Expression at least for any scientific text or fiction.

Best,
Martin

Morbus Iff, 15/01/2004, 22:58

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

I'm still having conceptual problems breaking a part a movie into WEMI. It's relatively "easy" when the movie is "known", like with a Kubrick or Spielberg or similar. But, stuff like SWIMFAN, MOTEL HELL, STACY, etc., I simply can't figure it out.

I originally suspected it was purely of ignorance and the fact that no one has published their own approaches to movies under FRBR, but the more I read, the more I see the same sort of thing over and over again: "expressions are difficult".

FRBR Listserv Archive

Most recently (in my reading, not publication-wise) is the Humphry Clinker examination by the OCLC:

"While it was possible to identify works and manifestations, identifying expressions was problematic ... Enhanced manifestation records where the roles of editors, illustrators, translators, and other contributors are explicitly identified may be a viable alternative to expressions ... With the enhanced manifestation record ... the FRBR model provides a powerful means to improve bibliographic organization and navigation.

How evil and destructive is it, for the time being, to not support expressions, at all, within an FRBRized application?

If I have a movie called SWIMFAN, is that a work? It is a "distinct intellectual or artistic creation", but it is also the REALIZATION: it's audio/visual committed to film. The only way I can think to get "one higher" than "realized through film" is the actual shooting script used. The audiovisual elements of a shooting script are REALIZED through the work of many people: the directory, the cinematographer, etc., etc.

But, the shooting script won't work... because FRBR says:

"By contrast, when the modification of a work involves a significant degree of independent intellectual or artistic effort, the result is viewed, for the purpose of this study, as a new work. Thus paraphrases, rewritings, adaptations for children, parodies, musical variations on a theme and free transcriptions of a musical composition are considered to represent new works."

Taking a script and turning it into film seems like a significant degree of work to me, so a film would have to be a work. Treating a film as a work is correct, because FRBR says/infers as much:

"Translations from one language to another, musical transcriptions and arrangements, and dubbed or subtitled versions of a film are also considered simply as different expressions of the same original work."

An expression "exclude[s] aspects of physical form", so I can't treat the expression of a movie as a DVD release. If I had two different translations of the movie, I don't think there's a problem:

W1: Swimfan
E1: Swimfan (English language)
M1: The DVD from Paramount Pictures.
E2: Swimfan (German language dub)

The above seems sane to me, and seems like the answer to my problems. In fact, FRBR says the above is sane in it's description of the work entity, which I've already snippeted above.

But, I feel the model is "dirty" when I don't have multiple expressions. If SWIMFAN ONLY had an English translation, then it "feels" like there's absolutely no difference between work and expression:

W1: Swimfan
E1: Swimfan (English language)
M1: The DVD from Paramount Pictures

In the above model, there's really no difference, whatsoever, between the Swimfan work and the Swimfan expression. Is there? Or am I being too granular? Should I treat WEMI as buckets, with an intended revisability and extensibility of "always"? Should I always assume (nay, hope!) that someone WILL translate SWIMFAN into another language? Should I, in the face of seemingly duplicity, always consider "language" the shining difference between a work (where language is not defined) and expression (where it is)?

I feel like I'm running around in circles on this expression thing - toeing the line between "yes, that's how you do it!" and "noOOoo, you've got it aLLLLl wrong, bucko!". Any tips are appreciated.

Morbus Iff

Patrick Le Boeuf, 16/01/2004, 11:16

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

FRBR Listserv Archive

Hi everyone (and in particular Kevin/Morbus),

I hope these tentative tips will be appreciated.

I am one of those very few cranks who believe, in contrast to many FRBR-addicts, that the Expression entity is, on the contrary, the easiest one (together with Item) in the model. It has to do with "text" (in the broadest sense of that term, see Anna Gunder <<http://www.hb.se/bhs/ith/23-01/ag.htm>> and Taniguchi <<http://www.slis.tsukuba.ac.jp/~taniguch/report200301.pdf>>) or "semiotic level". I understand any instance of the Expression entity as a distinct set of signs. There are many different kinds of signs in communication theory - written words are signs, uttered words are signs, images are signs, musical sounds are signs, musical notations are signs, etc. In the case of movies, the signs are extremely complex: a single shot from any movie contains so many different semiotic systems that you may lose all hope to analyze them in detail. However, Expression encompasses different levels of "semiotization" (does the word exist? I'm not sure, sorry). In 1999 or 2000, I don't remember precisely, the Associazione Italiana Biblioteche analyzed up to three distinct levels of Expression; more recently a French working group affiliated to AFNOR (the French standards body) found out 4 distinct levels of expression for musical works alone. Movies as such were not analyzed from that point of view, as far as I know. I did not explore that field in detail, but at first sight, very roughly speaking, here are my thoughts:

- Works do not "exist": only texts exist and can be grasped and can convey an idea of what the merely conceptual "work" is (in the FRBR conventions; in other contexts and in other models, the term "work" has other meanings - I definitely don't think that FRBR should "rule the world"). Movies are no exception: a "Movie" in se, as a Work, does not "exist", but it is conveyed by any of its possible "texts" (by "text" I don't mean the script: a script is a distinct textual work, that is related to the movie, but to which the movie cannot be reduced): these "texts" are its Expressions.

- Possible Expressions for a movie are:

- - its possible "versions", at the editing level, acknowledged by its creators (long version, short version, director's cut, producer's cut, integral version with additional shots originally cut off, version in 4 parts, etc.)

- - its possible "versions", at the editing level, not necessarily wanted by its creators (TV version, version for projecting in airplanes, expurgated version, abridged version...)

- - its possible versions, with an impact from technique (colorized version, sepia version, gilded version, restored version, Dolby version, version reframed for releasing as videocassette...[I don't mean the videocassette release itself: that is a Manifestation, but the edited content of such a Manifestation])

- - its possible linguistic versions (dubbed version, version with subtitles)

- - (There surely are many other possibilities, I can just think of those ones right now; and I'm sure there must be very, very tricky and complicated cases that don't fit nicely in the above categories)

A remake of a movie is definitely a distinct work. Of course, both are interrelated, through "bibliographic relationships", but they are two distinct instances of the Work entity, not just one (some speak of "superwork": in that context both the original movie and its remake are related to only one instance of the Superwork entity; but I don't like that much the Superwork notion, I don't find it very helpful, although it is intellectually utmost interesting). The ECHO model is very interesting; it is certainly based on FRBR, but it is not FRBR: it has different purposes and was originated in a different context. In the ECHO model, the textual transcription of an audiovisual work is still regarded as an "expression" of that audiovisual work, which is surely helpful in the context of ECHO but which I cannot agree upon, at least in the FRBR context: a textual transcription is, in my opinion, a distinct textual work, related to the audiovisual work but not as an expression thereof. As to the case of re-used shots (which are conceptually very close to "quotations"): a shot can only belong to an Expression, not to the Work itself (as it can always be edited and cut off); but sometimes you can't possibly know from which precise version a shot was taken (was it the director's cut? was it the producer's cut?). IN cases where you don't know, the FRBR Final Report says in substance: just go the the highest level (p. 57: "it may not be possible, if the precise edition of the base text is unknown, to state the relationship of the [related work] to the particular expression [...] on which it is based. In that case it is possible only to state the relationship [...] to

FRBR Listserv Archive

[the] work." If in a given application there is an urgent need for more specific "re-use" relationships at the shot level, as seems to be the case for Morbus, then I think that the MPEG Group has developed standards that would be more relevant to meet that need. I don't know precisely the MPEG standards, but I think I've heard there is something about that. Does anyone have a better knowledge of MPEG than mine, in order to help Morbus? Once again, FRBR is not the only model in the world, and the best model in the world is no other than just the one that meets your needs.

Best wishes,
Patrick

Barbara Tillett, 16/01/2004, 14:58
Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

TO: Morbus Iff <morbus@disobey.com>

Would you please identify who you are? (Perhaps you have done this in earlier emails - I am just now catching up after being away from work a week). I know this is an open listserv, but I would greatly appreciate knowing with whom I am corresponding. Thanks
- Barbara Tillett

Morbus Iff, 16/01/2004, 15:26
Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

This rubbed me the wrong way. What I've done has little to do with my reasons for being here (I'm not a librarian, I'm not a cataloguer). It seems akin to asking "how old are you?". It wouldn't have been so bad if you had responded to my email ALONG with the Inquisition, but now it just seems that "who I am" will control whether I'm worth your time. But hey, I'm sure it's all a grande misunderstanding, "boy, is my face red!" and all.

With that in mind:

<http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/au/779>

<http://developer.apple.com/internet/contributors.html#hemenway>

<http://www.disobey.com/> (an umbrella of a dozen projects -

that's the problem, really. I've done SO much stuff that

I'm not easily pigeon-holed into "who are you?". in fact,

I was previously denied to this listserv because I had no

apparent reason to be interested in your "esoteric librarian"

discussions. in hindsight, perhaps that was the right decision,

no? [though, I did get warned that "no one expects a pseudonym"])

From a researcher/librarian-ish point of view, the two most related projects would be my second book, Spidering Hacks, which covers how to aggregate information from the 'Net (including Library of Congress screen scrapes) and AmphetaDesk, which was the first cross-platform, open-sourced news aggregator.

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0596005776/>

<http://www.disobey.com/amphetadesk/>

The reason I'm here (of which I've only partially alluded to in previous FRBR messages) is a new funded open source project I've been working on, whose basis is FRBR:

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/>

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/?ProjectGoals>

I've been told from Art Rhyno, author of "Using Open Source Systems for Digital Libraries", that I'm "the *only* developer working on FRBR from a practical systems perspective right now"

So there! ;)

Morbus Iff

Barbara Tillett, 16/01/2004, 14:58
Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

TO: Morbus Iff

FRBR Listserv Archive

It's a simple matter that I like to know with whom I'm communicating, sorry if it grabbed you the wrong way - certainly not intended. I like your questions and could better respond if I had a clue about where you are coming from. It's the reference librarian in me that wants to know more context, so I can better answer queries. So now you've provided it, and I thank you.

I'm delighted to know of others out there who are working to apply FRBR and commend your initiative. OCLC, RLG,VTLS, and Innovative Interfaces also are working on FRBR applications, and you are probably aware of other applications in Europe and Australia. During the American Libraries Association meeting, the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules has a Format Variations Working Group that calls together vendors and developers working on FRBR applications to talk together (under the kind hosting of OCLC that has provided a meeting place for the past several meetings). We usually meet Friday mornings before the conference begins, but next time, as there is a pre-conference on FRBR, we will meet at 5:30 Thursday of the pre-conference (June 24) in Orlando. Maybe you'd like to come to the pre-conference as well as the discussion group? - Barbara

Morbus Iff, 16/01/2004, 16:51

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

*>It's a simple matter that I like to know with whom I'm communicating,
>sorry if it grabbed you the wrong way - certainly not intended. I like
>your questions and could better respond if I had a clue about where you
>are coming from. It's the reference librarian in me that wants to know
>more context, so I can better answer queries. So now you've provided*

Awesome.

*>I'm delighted to know of others out there who are working to apply FRBR
>and commend your initiative. OCLC, RLG,VTLS, and Innovative Interfaces
>also are working on FRBR applications, and you are probably aware of
>other applications in Europe and Australia. During the American*

Yup, I've been seeing some and researching others. With the LibDB project, there are two goals that differentiate it from the above:

- * it needs to support a "casual" user, ultimately meaning a MySQL or PostgreSQL backend for the database. The application is being designed to be installable on a "generic" webhost (like a geocities or other common monthly provider) with only FTP access, and NOT a dedicated machine or farm of machines (though, it could certainly do that too). I'm trying to remove the "cost" of entry.

- * You won't need to know who any of the above bodies are, or any of the terminology that one would typically associate with librarians or cataloging. the interface is being designed so that a user who would normally be SEARCHING for items could also be ENTERING them: it's a "personal" OPAC, really, for your own stuff.

I've wanted a personal OPAC founded on "true" cataloguing principles for quite a while: I'm a rather heavy collector of nearly everything, and if I'm going to take the years to catalogue everything I own, I want to make sure I only need to do it once. Every bit of open source software I've seen concerning "personal libraries" "failed":

- * it assumed I was a library: I don't need acquisition management, I don't need client accounts, I don't need a heavy reliance on loaning. I just want to enter in all my stuff smartly and easily. The less clicks, the better. I've got a lot of stuff.

- * it assumed I didn't want to be a librarian. In direct violation of the above, I needed the application to smartly organize the data. too many low-end systems I've seen stick the "author" of a book into one database field, regardless of how many authors there actually was. nor was there the ability to add illustrators, editors, or anything similar. besides the evil of data duplication, having a single field for "cast" is just plain moronic.

- * it was only one media type. A lot of things I've seen are for only one type of media: books or movies or music. I needed something that would hold them all TOGETHER - not uniquely. I've seen some applications that could accept multiple types, but if I search for a phrase, I'd only be searching through books, or only through movies. I don't want to find just "Neil Gaiman" in books, I also want to see that he wrote the "Neverwhere" television series. In most applications, this would be two searches, not the one I want.

FRBR Listserv Archive

* it wasn't readily expandable. You may not think the letterer of a comic book is important, but I certainly do. A lot of applications I've seen wouldn't let me add that data.

>meeting place for the past several meetings). We usually meet Friday
>mornings before the conference begins, but next time, as there is a
>pre-conference on FRBR, we will meet at 5:30 Thursday of the
>pre-conference (June 24) in Orlando. Maybe you'd like to come to the
>pre-conference as well as the discussion group? - Barbara

I appreciate the offer, but I've a phobia of travelling, and I suspect I'm turning into a physical xenophobe: I rarely go outside, and I no longer have a phone. Someone set up a chatroom! ;)

Morbus Iff

Andrea Leigh, 17/01/2004, 00:15

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

Coming out of lurkdom ...

You may want to take a look at the Moving Image Collections (MIC) project, which contains a MIC/ViDe Application Profile database in Microsoft Access to create records in MPEG-7 and Dublin Core for digital video, audio and images, and it is available for download http://gondolin.rutgers.edu/MIC/text/how/cataloging_utility.htm. I'm far from an expert on MPEG-7, but have been informed that: 1) MPEG-7 uses XML as the language of choice for the textual representation of content, 2) supports creation of descriptions of dynamic and permanent segments, 3) supports textual and non-textual data, and can marry both in indexing, 4) can reside native on an MPEG-4 stream, and 5) is inherently "FRBR-ized," meaning descriptions can be structured in terms of work (e.g. Luhrman's Romeo and Juliet), expression (director's cut of Luhrman's Romeo and Juliet), and manifestation (VHS instantiation of director's cut of Luhrman's Romeo and Juliet).

Some other brief notes:

I was intrigued by the concept that Morbus brought up of contextualizing works by bringing together the film along with ancillary materials used in the making of the film, such as a script (conceptually more an archival descriptive model than a bibliographic model of access through related works). Howard Besser identifies this as a paradigm shift in user expectations (See "Digital Preservation of Moving Image Material?" <<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~howard/Papers/amia-longevity.html>>). A project attempting to bring that type of contextualization through virtual means is the British Film Institute's screenonline (<http://www.screenonline.org.uk/>).

Andrea

Morbus Iff, 21/01/2004, 02:57

Re: Movies/NTSC Equivalent To Books/Large Print?

Hey all, just catching up on old messages. My original email on this subject was:

>Assuming, for the sake of conversational brevity:

> * the normal print book is letter-for-letter
> the same as the large print book.
> * an NTSC movie is the frame-for-frame the same
> as an American version, but shorter.

>Should they be split as different expressions or manifestations?

For the archives and other readers, some clarification concerning NTSC and PAL movies: FPS - Frames Per Second. All NTSC video (the standard in North America and Japan) unreels at 24 fps, the same speed at which motion picture film is projected. PAL video (the European standard), on the other hand, plays at a slightly faster speed of 25 fps speed. Consequently, the same film will play shorter in PAL than in NTSC, even if it is absolutely uncut.

-- <http://www.videowatchdog.com/home/Glossary.htm>

"same film" is the key term here. A 89 minute movie filmed in Germany plays out as a 92 minute movie in the US, with absolutely no modification save for frame speed.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Since a movie's frame speed is equivalent to a book's print size (ie. faster or slower frames in a movie has no effect on its content, enlarging the print-size of a book has no effect on its content), my determination is that:

* one single movie, released in NTSC and PAL formats, is equivalent to one single book, released in normal and large print. Thus, they are two different manifestations of the same expression, even though the extant (page count, film duration) is different.

Note that is the **film** itself, not counting ephemera as video company logos (the distributor of an NTSC film is invariably different from the distributor of the PAL version), FBI warnings, MPAA ratings certificates (or similar), etc.

Thanks to Barbara B. Tillett and Martin Doerr for responding.

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 21/01/2004, 03:39

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

*>If the primary user of your software is an individual for their own
>home or work use and not libraries, you can definitely include all the
>niceties that libraries cannot afford to provide. I'd love to see some*

I suspect that my primary user will be an individual/home user, but the "official" statement for user has been broken into three profiles, all catered to by a different interface, but all working with the same data and database:

A casual user will care more about getting their data into the database, and less about how well the data respects formatting rules, uses proper and standardized subject headings, or whether their synopsis is spelled or punctuated correctly (or even exists, for that matter). Such users will rather edit the title of a book to reflect their copy, then add an alternate title to complement the one from the Library of Congress or OCLC. This user profile assumes they "know what they're doing", and any attempt by LibDB to teach them otherwise is an "error". A typical search from this user will be "show me all the horror movies I own."

A discriminating user wants to learn the "right way to do things", and they're more tolerant to learning new terms, definitions, and concepts if they believe it will make their database better, stronger, faster, harder. This profile is willing to enter as much data as possible (either manually, or by accepting aggregated data that LibDB provides), in an attempt to create a "personal Amazon" or "personal IMDB" and reap the benefits thereof. There's a fine line here, of course: they probably won't be willing to remap their personal genre's or subject's to the thousands of possible options from something like the Library of Congress. A typical search from this user will be "show me all the horror movies I own that were catered by Pizza Hut" (or possibly "had Alan Smithee as a cast or crew member").

A librarian or cataloger will probably want to know and select the granularity of whether data lives in a manifestation or expression, and they may require additional display fields that allow selection of in-use Library of Congress subject headings or similar topic map. On the other hand, they probably won't need as much inline help regarding what data to put in which fields, or the best way to format the entry according to the AACR or local style rulings. They'll likely need a higher level of acquisition management: allowing them to see which items have been loaned to patrons or other libraries, which items have broken bindings and are under repair, etc. A typical search will be "show me all the horror movies we have that are currently available for loaning, have been loaned more than ten times in the last fiscal year, and have been formally reviewed by Roger Ebert."

>way for that to trickle back to the bibliographic and authority records

>in some "authorized" and "controlled" way so we have trusted sources to

>enhance cataloging that libraries provide...we already do that a little

Yup - that has been planned for mentally and via the database. Data will be accessible from URLs that allow the end-user (the library, you, etc.) to choose WHAT data they want to see and what FORMAT they want that data in. Likewise, the data they've provided can be used to grab more data from the site. Everything is based on a 20 character alphanumeric, allowing stuff like this:

```
# show the HTML for person '12k31j189LK8712Klqpa'
```

```
http://example.com/person/12k31j189LK8712Klqpa
```

FRBR Listserv Archive

```
# get a MODS or FOAF representation of this person.  
http://example.com/person/12k31j189LK8712Klqpa/mods  
http://example.com/person/12k31j189LK8712Klqpa/foaf
```

```
# get a list of concepts in HTML or RDF.  
http://example.com/concepts/  
http://example.com/concepts/rdf
```

```
# get manifestation '12k31j189LK8712Klqpa' as HTML and MARC.  
http://example.com/manifestation/12k31j189LK8712Klqpa  
http://example.com/manifestation/12k31j189LK8712Klqpa/marc
```

I've not yet decided upon a URL system for searching of the database - I may end up using XPath, I may just use normal query string.

```
# show all annotations for this particular expression.  
http://example.com/annotations?expression=12k31j189LK8712Klqpa
```

>Having a personal library system is a great idea, and I am delighted to
>see it being FRBR-based and hope you can also build in "authority
>control" but with a new twist to cluster variant forms of names and let
>the user decide which one to use for display purposes (their own
Variant names are currently supported, but there's no user-selection on which should
be considered authoritative. From an aggregation/practice standpoint, the
"authoritative" record would be the first discovered instance of an entity.
Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 21/01/2004, 03:59

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

>You may want to take a look at the Moving Image Collections (MIC) project,
>which contains a MIC/ViDe Application Profile database in Microsoft Access
>to create records in MPEG-7 and Dublin Core for digital video, audio and
>http://gondolin.rutgers.edu/MIC/text/how/cataloging_utility.htm. I'm far
Andrea - this proves interesting. Thanks!

>Some other brief notes:

>I was intrigued by the concept that Morbus brought up of contextualizing
>works by bringing together the film along with ancillary materials used in
>the making of the film, such as a script (conceptually more an archival
>descriptive model than a bibliographic model of access through related
>works). Howard Besser identifies this as a paradigm shift in user
>expectations (See "Digital Preservation of Moving Image Material?" <
><http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~howard/Papers/amia-longevity.html>>). A project

I agree - a fair portion of this comes from the explosion of DVD extras - there's a
definite interest in going "beyond the movie", as evidenced by the deleted scenes,
commentaries, "behind the scenes" and so forth included on 90% of the DVDs today. I
could probably pick out 20 of my last 100 DVDs and find the script available on the
DVD-ROM portion. It's gotten even "worse" three years after Besser's article, with
"Special Editions" being released first, then "Ultimate Collector's Edition", then
"The Version You've Never Seen" (most annoying example: ARMY OF DARKNESS, which has
about five different versions all proclaiming to be slightly better and more expanded
than the last).

This could have happened a dozen years ago had LDs been affordable.

Interestingly, he also addresses the description of parts ("scenes") within a movie,
similarly to a single article from a serial:

"Recent enhanced DVDs appeal to the web-surfer mentality. Adding additional material
about the making of the film, interviews with cast and crew, stills from the set, out-
takes, and other ancillary materials all appeal to the web-surfer expectation of
having a vast array of related primary-source material available. Over time we may
very well see a demand for users to just view particular clips (Besser 1994) within a
completed movie."

Morbus Iff

FRBR Listserv Archive

Ketil Albertsen, 21/01/2004, 21:16

Re: Movies/NTSC Equivalent To Books/Large Print?

>>* an NTSC movie is the frame-for-frame the same as an American version, but shorter.
>> Should they be split as different expressions or manifestations?

[...]

> Consequently, the same film will play shorter in PAL than in NTSC, even if it is absolutely uncut.

[...]

> "same film" is the key term here. A 89 minute movie filmed in Germany

> plays out as a 92 minute movie in the US, with absolutely no

> modification save for frame speed.

A couple of technical details, which has to do with video conversion rather than bibliographical description:

You will have to do *some* conversion (or adaptation, if you prefer that term) between NTSC and PAL - most certainly in the VHS format, but even for DVDs you would do a number of things. The NTSC version plays 29,94 frames per second, an playing it frame-by-frame at 24 fps would shorten it by 20 percent, so the 92 min movie would play in less than 74 min. Furthermore, all sounds would be raised in pitch by about three halftones, which would be very noticeable, even to a complete untrained ear.

Your calculation is based on a very simple adaptation where the 29,94 fps frame rate is reduced to slightly less than 24 fps by a simple duplication of every 5th field (i.e. half-frame) - which is about 4%, rather than 20%, wrong. Very few "PAL viewers" would ever notice that movements are 4% faster than "natural", except that the movie ends earlier than expected. However, the 4% raise in sound pitch is noticed by a significant fraction of the viewers, so when a high quality conversion is made, the sound should be resampled to compensate for this. (A really high quality transfer should of course convert the frame rate to 25 fps rather than 24 fps as well.)

There are other things that must be considered, too, such as the number of scan lines in the image. Neither NTSC nor PAL pixels (i.e. picture elements) are square, but the height to width ratio is different in PAL vs. NTSC, so if you display the DVD in the "wrong" format point by point, circles will display as ovals, squares as rectangles.

So a "completely unconverted" DVD would be totally unacceptable, and the 4% difference in playing time is a result of a not-top-notch conversion job.

Anyway: There should be little doubt that a movie in different formats, where the intellectual and artistic contents is identical, represents different manifestations rather than different expressions.

Your other example, large type books, is equally obvious (same expression, different manifestations), in 99.9999% of all cases. The remaining, tiny little fraction of a percent, is limited to poetry and related expressions, where typography is used more or less as graphic art. I have seen poetry books where a poem is printed one letter to a page(!), books where words like "far apart" are in fact printed far apart etc. etc. If you take away the (typo)graphical artwork, you express the work - or maybe we should say you do *not* express it! - in a different manner, a different expression.

These examples are obviously very different from large print books. I mention it only to emphasize that we cannot categorically state that typographical choices *never* are part of the expression!

> Note that is the *film* itself, not counting ephemera as video

> company logos (the distributor of an NTSC film is invariably

> different from the distributor of the PAL version), FBI warnings,

> MPAA ratings certificates (or similar), etc.

... and this is parallel to a book published republished in a different sort of binding, maybe by another publisher who puts another list of "Titles in the xxx series" before the title page, another publisher logo on the back etc. etc. There is no doubt that the expression is the same, the manifestation is new.

Ketil Albertsen, National Library of Norway

Liv Aasa Holm, 22/01/2004, 10:35

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

FRBR Listserv Archive

I have only browsed through the messages in this thread, but would like to give some comments.

1. What is a Work. When is something a new Work and not a new Expression.

I think this is dependant on the cataloguing rules and as such dependant on your environment (regretfully). Personally I would like to consider "My fair Lady" an expression of "Pygmalion" (the play Pygmalion), but AACR 2 (I have been told) regards "My Fair Lady" as a separate Work. This is the reason why we some years ago had this discussion at several ELAG seminars (ELAG = European Library Automation Group) and that this discussion has started again: How to link these obviously related works. Is a Work-to-Work link sufficient, or should ther be some level in the model.

2. The problem with the Expression level is how AUTOMATICALLY to identify an expression. Usually it is not so difficult intellectually. And, as several projects have shown, the majority of Works have only one Expression and one Manifestation. Why then use the Expression level? Because it looks as if it will greatly improve the ability to present search results in a meaningful way, in particular when there are several expressions of a Work and/or several manifestations of an expression. AND!! because the WEMI model gives a much better data model for the data. Here at Oslo College two master students are (together with 3 of the faculty) working on different realisations of the FRBR model (and comparing it with Taniguchi's model). One database has data about Peer Gynt (and related works, expressions, manifestations etc.), one has music records. Both have just a few records. In the Peer Gynt one there are 315 Works, 615 Expressions and som 7xx manifestations. In that database there are many expressions of some of the Works, but it would have been nearly impossible to identify them automatically.

3. How to identify a new manifestation. This should not be a problem, but it is. A conversion program will fail in many instances. So again, starting from fresh with a FRBR-model database, ther should not be problems (not quite as many in any case) in getting data into the correct classes. But trying to convert an existing manifestation-based database into a FRBR-based database will give problems.

4. The problem of having enough (and correct) fields for different types of data (have I understood the problem correct? Or was this a problem with other types of software?) is not a FRBR problem for two reasons.

- the attributes listed in FRBR are not a complete list. Types of relations can be expanded unlimited

- the logical and physical data model will take care of multiple values in attributes (among other things).

Actually, the physical data model in a FRBR database is definitely not identical to the conceptual model.

I think the FRBR model should be aplicable to any type of document. And of course one must have different types of objects in the same database.

I should have read all the emails before I wrote this, sorry if it is completely beside the point.

Liv A. Holm

Ketil Albertsen, 22/01/2004, 16:46

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

> 1. *What is a Work. When is something a new Work and not a new Expression.*

When I explain FRBR to newcomers, I usually say that the Work is **what** an artist (author, film maker etc.) wants to say, i.e. his "message". The Work is created when a creative mind creates something new to "tell the world".

When the artist decides on **how** he wants to say it, he creates an Expression: An writer selects words, a movie director designs the scenes, camera positions etc.

I know that some people may consider the following to be swearing in church (but I dare, anyway): Yes, the expression **may** have a material representation, in my view. An author delivering his new novel to the publishing house in the form of a pile of typewritten sheets - words only, no decision made about neither binding, typeface, pagination or anything like that - communicates, in written form, his expression. It is **not** a Manifestation in the FRBR sense; it is just a way of communicating the end result of his creative work to the publisher who will produce a Manifestation of it.

Defining the "wrapping" of the work (binding, typography etc. for a book, physical format), i.e. creating the Manifestation, is a **non-creative** operation, it adds

FRBR Listserv Archive

neither to the "what" the creator wants to say or "how" he says it - it is simply a mechanism for him to get his message out. (If any book designers read this, they will probably protest wildly... Their work, too, may be highly creative

So: If an artist creates something, a "what" that hasn't been created before, he makes a new Work. If the same "what" is expressed in a different way - in a different language, say - no new Work, but a new Expression is made.

In principle, we can imagine a creative artist expressing the same ideas, the same work, through two different media (not only words in two different languages), e.g. a painter doing the same picture in oil and in watercolor. Maybe **in principle** it is possible to express exactly the same in very different media, such as a novel and a movie, but I doubt that it has ever been done - there will almost always be a significant creative element in one medium that is absent in the other that affects the "what" of what is communicated, i.e. it is another work.

I assume that in most cases, translators strive to communicate the original "what" as complete and unmodified as possible - it is not a translator's job to let his own creativity show in the result. But in some cases - notably in poetry, to some degree in scene plays, and sometimes even in novels - there is no way to make a translation that is not significantly colored by the translation process. Most people recognize A.Bjerke's free translations of Shakespeare's works to Norwegian as a high quality Work of **translation**. I think it is a pity that FRBR (currently) provides no mechanism for defining the translation work as a Work in its own right. If we had that, the Bjerke translation could modelled as a composite consisting of two creative components: That of Shakespeare's work combined with that of Bjerke's work. In today's FRBR, this is not possible, but the model could very well be expanded to allow for this.

We can easily find other examples (e.g. look back in the mailing list archives for the "What is a song" thread almost a year ago): Putting an existing poem together with an already existing melody to a "song" (i.e. two already known Works, and their Expressions) hardly represents any significant "creative" effort. Together, they form a composite Expression. If FRBR had recognized composite Expressions, with elements based on different Works, no new Work would have to be created. Today, if we want to treat the song as an Expression (and we do!), we must model it as a new Work entity - because of the FRBR formalism, not because a new creative effort was done.

A third example: An illustrated text is a composite expression of two distinct creative Works - that of the author and that of the illustrator. Again, we must choose between creating an artificial Work entity, or recognizing the bonds between text and illustrations only at the manifestation level. But that's not right either - embodying several expressions into one manifestation is primarily for facilitating the publication of several **independent** expressions as one unit, e.g. as an anthology. An illustrated work is something else. We need a way to "bundle" distinct creative Works, resulting in distinct Expressions, into composite Expressions!

(There are cases where the merging of words and music into a song, or text and pictures into an illustrated book, requires a creative effort large enough to justify modelling it as a distinct "Work of adaptation". This does not remove the need for a "bundling" mechanism at Expression level - it just adds another creative element to the bundle! - This is similar to the translator's creative work.)

> *I think this is dependant on the cataloguing rules and as such dependant*

> *on your environment (regretfully).*

The FRBR model and report tries to do two things at once: It defines a model for **real world** concepts, and it takes steps to create **descriptions** of those real world concepts. Sometimes, it may be difficult to see from the text when the report refers to the object or the description of it.

Actually, **most** of the report describes "the world", **not** the description of it; FRBR would apply just as well even if there was not a single bibliographical catalog anywhere. A Work "is created by" a Person - this is talking about a real Work, and a real Person. Obviously, no Person authority record created a MARC record for the Work! Same with all the other entities and relationships: They are out there, in the world, independent of whatever description we want to make of them.

A thorough analysis of **what** we want to describe in our bibliographical records is essential, before we start considering **how** we are going to describe it. FRBR has taken the first step (but, as indicated above: I am far from sure that the first step is completed yet!), and started on the second step - but no more than started. For the

FRBR Listserv Archive

most part, we are still discussion how the FRBR "language" for describing the real world applies to real world phenomena.

Cataloguing rules do not apply until we start creating descriptions, based on the understanding of the world we gain from applying the FRBR model on it. Doing it the other way around - letting the language used for bibliographical description limit our analysis of real world phenomena - is, in my honest opinion, not the right way of doing things.

> *Personally I would like to consider "My fair Lady" an expression of
> "Pygmalion" (the play Pygmalion), but AACR 2 (I have been
> told) regards "My Fair Lady" as a separate Work.*

Making "My fair Lady" definitely involved a significant element of creativity. So there should be no doubt that a Work was created. I have never compared Pygmalion with My fair Lady, so I couldn't tell if the latter should be treated as a self-contained work, based on Pygmalion, or be considered a composite Expression where the Pygmalion text is one of the components, the music another. (My uneducated guess would be that the musical form requires so many changes to the text of play form that it should not be considered "reusing" the old Expression.)

> 2. *The problem with the Expression level is how AUTOMATICALLY to identify
> an expression. Usually it is not so difficult intellectually.*

I would like to treat the problem of automatic creation of descriptions as a description problem, not as a real world modelling problem. Or rather: The expression should be identified in the real world, without the constraints of a description method, and then describing it will be comparatively simple.

I am not saying that the total work is small, but I think doing it in the real world first is the right way of doing the work.

> *And, as several projects have shown, the majority of Works have only
> one Expression and one Manifestation. Why then use the Expression level?*

We may disagree with the decision to distinguish between the "What to say" and the "How to say it" abstraction levels - we may think that there is no reason to distinguish. But the FRBR designers looked at e.g. books in different translations, different arrangements of the same musical work, revisions of works to make the (roughly same) message come through in a better way, and they decided, "Yes, by offering tools for managing such constructs, we are able to describe the world in a much better way. The problems of managing them *without* having a modelling tools are much greater than the disadvantage of having a modelling tool with more general capabilities than strictly needed to handle the simple cases".

I feel the inconvenience of a more general tool insignificant. But even if you disagree: That simply is the modelling language defined by FRBR. So you use it.

> *Because it looks as if it will greatly improve the ability to present search
> results in a meaningful way, in particular when there are several
> expressions of a Work and/or several manifestations of an expression.*

I see it slightly differently: We use WEMI because that's how we find it reasonably simple to describe actual phenomena in the real world. A description structured by the same understanding of the world is (hopefully) good because the users will recognize in the model what they see in the world. So, good catalog structures is a "spinoff" of good real world modelling. (The end result is the same, but our understanding of how we reach that goal will affect how we use the model.)

> 3. [...]

> *But trying to convert an existing manifestation-based database into a
> FRBR-based database will give problems.*

You don't need to go to MARC-to-FRBR to see problems... :-) There was an article (I can give you a reference once I find my copy!) illustrating how to convert the MARC 245 field from UniMARC to MARC21, and the number of separate steps was something like 15-20. The article claimed that 245 was of "average" complexity, neither the simplest one nor the most complex.

Conversion to FRBR will require the same type of logic, but the complexity will be much higher. In particular, correlation of different fields will be required in a lot of cases. There is a tremendous problem with Note fields - in particular in older MARC records, lots of semantic information can be found in notes, because there was no specific field for that info defined when the record was created.

I believe that the only way to do MARC-to-FRBR conversion is to write a (rather complex) translation program that does all the trivial stuff, but stops to ask a librarian for help whenever it encounters some unknown or difficult situation.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Hopefully, the librarian will have an option to tell the program "Next time you run into the same situation, treat it in the same way without bothering me". But hoping for a fully automatic translation is far from realistic.

Also note that FRBR defines a language for structuring the world, not for structuring descriptions of it. So systems managing descriptions may differ significantly. We probably won't have one single conversion program that can be used by everyone. That would require the definition of an exact syntax for a well defined set of attributes, and this is not found in the FRBR report today. I guess that waiting for such a specification will be too late - it will likely take several years, and FRBR based catalogs will be established (and existing catalogs converted to these systems) long before an exchange syntax is defined.

> *Actually, the physical data model in a FRBR database is definitely not identical to the conceptual model.*

Well, it could be. But since FRBR primarily models real world data, a model of descriptions of the world will probably be more different than a digital model of the real world. In particular, if the real world data *is* the real world, such as in a publisher's data system where the Expression is the manuscript file received from the author, the Manifestation is the set of parameters for controlling the photosetter and other equipment used to manufacture the printing, the model may be more than a model. A description usually serves purposes different from the real world objects, so there may be good arguments for organizing catalog data differently.

> *I think the FRBR model should be aplicable to any type of document. And of course one must have different types of objects in the same database.*

One interesting question is whether we should have both real world data and descriptions of them in the same database. A digital novel is a real world book, not a description of it. We have a separate description, e.g. a MARC record. We have a publisher record as well, describing the publisher. There is a real world "published by" relationship between the *book* and the *publisher*. Should we represent this as a reference from the book object to a publisher object? Or should that be invisible in the real world book, represented only through a description in the MARC record? If we decide to represent it in the real world (i.e. with our digital book object), should the book refer to the *description* of the publisher, or should we introduce a representation of the publisher as a "real world object" that the book can relate to? This may seem like hairsplitting, but it becomes essential the day we make a *second description* of the publisher - for some reason we might want to create a DC publisher record. Will the book then have *two* relationships to a publisher - one to the DC record and one to the entry in the authority register? (Bad idea!) A much cleaner solution is achieved if the publisher is modelled, digitally, as a real world object, and the description(s) of this object, whether they are DC records, authority register entries etc., are treated as distinct from the record representing the real world publisher.

I really wish the FRBR report had made explicit the distinction between an object and its description! Implicitly, it does, but it should be much more visible in the text.

Yours respectfully
Ketil Albertsen

Dan Matei, 22/01/2004, 20:41

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

I think it is better to discuss this matter in "public", on the list. It is too important, in my view. So, with Ketil's permission, here is his post, followed by mine.

Thanks Ketil.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ketil Albertsen <Ketil.Albertsen@nb.no>

To: 'Dan Matei' <dan@cimec.ro>

Date: Thu, 22 Jan 2004 19:40:27 +0100

Subject: RE: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

> > > *in my view. An author delivering his new novel to the publishing house in the form of a pile of typewritten sheets - words only, no decision made about*

FRBR Listserv Archive

> > > *neither binding, typeface, pagination or anything like that - communicates,*
> > > *in written form, his expression. It is *not* a Manifestation in the FRBR sense;*
> > > *it is just a way of communicating the end result of his creative work to the*
> > > *publisher who will produce a Manifestation of it.*
> > However ! The original manuscript or typescript "generates" a 'manifestation' exemplified by one item. Why not ?
> To quote Tsichritzis & Lochovsky: "Data Models" (one of the great classics of data modelling): An abstraction is "the ability to hide detail and concentrate on general, common properties of a set of objects".
> Well... I make the implicit assumption that the WEMI hierarchy is an abstraction hierarchy. It seems to me that most people who has been working seriously with FRBR agree on this. (However, many beginners, as well as many people who has never before worked with data models, repeatedly suggest a use of the entity classes as if they were, at least partly, *aggregation* levels. I will not consider that further - I see no justification for that approach in the Report.)
> Different FRBR manifestations have different properties with regard to "wrapping" of the message: A choice of typeface, of binding etc. for books, and similar for other media. These properties are details of presentation that are of no interest when considering the Expression abstraction of the various manifestations; an Expression doesn't have *any* properties related to typography and physical format.
> Nor has the typed manuscript. Well, of course it is typed using 10 cpi or 12 cpi character size, on A4 or on 8.5 by 11 paper, but all that is *insignificant*. It is not convey any *information*. Only the sequence of words matters, for all further handling of the manuscript.
> When you create a model a real world phenomenon as a tool to understand and structure your thoughts about the real world, you will certainly not let the modelling be steered by properties that has no significance whatsoever in the real world. Non-information-carrying properties are not modelled (in a well designed data model).
> What does and doesn't have significance obviously depends on your reason for doing the analysis, your "domain of discourse". E.g. if your task is to plan typewriter paper delivery to the members of a writer's association, the paper size would be significant. But I can see no reason why any library, or anyone in the publishing industry, would consider the physical characteristics of the manuscript sufficiently important or information carrying, to be modelled in a data model.
> So, the manuscript has only those "general, common properties of a set of [future manifestation] objects" (in the sense of *significant* properties) - it *is* an Expression, not a Manifestation.
> In some, very special cases, a manuscript is taken through the process of creating a Manifestation and a number of Items. Some classical authors' handwritten manuscripts have been published this way, as facsimiles of the author's writing. *Then* you create a manifestation, where the parameters are set to be identical to sheets used by the author's etc. Yet, this is a different thing: You create a manifestation *making these properties significant*. If you do that, you certainly have a Manifestation. But not until then.
> When I wrote my entry to the FRBR list, I was considering "swearing" even louder: I can imagine even materializations of Works! Sometimes, an author (or other artist) leaves clues to what he "tries to say". His "message", more or less independent of the actual words that comes out. "I wrote it that way to convey to the user the idea of...". Nowadays, it has become popular to include this kind of stuff in DVDs among the "extras" - the director adding his comments to each scene, on an alternative sound track. In this case, the material has been through a process of determining a form, a "wrapper", and it items have been mass produced, so it is much more than only the Work abstraction - there is both an Expression, a Manifestation (or more), and a number of items. But if you come across an author's notes from when he was writing the book, it is a different matter, though: Some authors draw complex diagrams of personal relationships, of sequences of events, geographical properties etc. of their stories - not to be included in the manuscript and the final book, but as a way for themselves to structure the creative process, *before* the words are selected, and independent of trivial matters such as the choice of words :-)
> This represents a materialization of the Work entity.
> We should not confuse "material" with "Manifestation". The author materializing his idea, his message to the world, still operates at the abstraction level of the Work, as long as this materialization does not control or restrict the way the Work is later

FRBR Listserv Archive

expressed. The information content is limited to **what** the author will say, not **how**. Manifestation properties are not information bearing, in this context, so they shouldn't affect the modelling.

> I did not mention this, because I think a significant fraction of the FRBR list is not sufficiently familiar with data modelling to make that mental leap of starting to relate to materialized Work entities. Relating to a typewritten manuscript as being void of significant Manifestation properties is far easier, so I decided to do that as a first step...

> It looks to me as if your response was sent to me only, not to the FRBR list. So I answer directly to you, without copy to the list. If you would like to forward this to the list, feel free to do so!

> Ketil Albertsen

Well, I like your theory, but I disagree :-)

So...

> Well... I make the implicit assumption that the WEMI hierarchy is an abstraction hierarchy.

Me too.

> Different FRBR manifestations have different properties with regard to "wrapping" of the message: A choice of typeface, of binding etc. for books, and similar for other media. These properties are details of presentation that are of no interest when considering the Expression abstraction of the various manifestations; an Expression doesn't have **any** properties related to typography and physical format.

Right again.

> Nor has the typed manuscript. Well, of course it is typed using 10 cpi or 12 cpi character size, on A4 or on 8.5 by 11 paper, but all that is **insignificant**. It is not convey any **information**. Only the sequence of words matters, for all further handling of the manuscript.

Hmmm ! Usually so it is. Always ? What about emphasis, "cutting" of the verses, and things like that. And in the manuscripts proper, oh, even more. Think of a manuscript scores. Especially of post-serial music ! A lot of "messages" beside the "sequence of words", or notes - for that matter.

> So, the manuscript has only those "general, common properties of a set of [future manifestation] objects" (in the sense of **significant** properties) - it **is** an Expression, not a Manifestation.

It is also an 'expression', yes ! But ...

We agree that W - E - M hierarchy is a suite of abstractions, reified in specific kinds of records. OK. But this abstraction process starts from the 'item' in hand (the concrete entity), and goes I -> M -> E -> W !

Thus, I can't jump - within the abstraction process - directly from 'item' to 'expression'. I speak for myself :-)

When I act as a cataloguer (it happens from time to time :-), I behave like this.

What do you think ?

Dan Matei

Ketil Albertsen, 22/01/2004, 23:10

Re: Modelling/representing entities above Item (was:Still Fighting with Movie Expressions)

(This is diverting from the Movie discussion, so I changed the subject line)

> Dan Matei:

> Ketil Albertsen:

> > Nor has the typed manuscript. Well, of course it is typed using 10 cpi or 12 cpi character size, on A4 or on 8.5 by 11 paper, but all that is **insignificant**. It is not convey any **information**. Only the sequence of words matters, for all further handling of the manuscript.

> Hmmm ! Usually so it is. Always ? What about emphasis, "cutting" of the verses, and things like that. And in the manuscripts proper, oh, even more. Think of a manuscript scores. Especially of post-serial music ! A lot of "messages" beside the "sequence of words", or notes - for that matter.

Sure. I used the term "words" in a slightly generalized sense, to mean something like (in an over-academic way of phrasing it) "the information-bearing symbols selected by the artist to convey his message". When an author indicates some extended semantic

FRBR Listserv Archive

contents of a word beyond the mere sequence of characters, e.g. by underscoring, he augments the information in that word symbol. But this information relates to the contents, the "message", not to the presentation format. The way such emphasis is actually manifest in the final product is still to be decided at the Manifestation level, e.g. use of boldface, italics etc.

There *are* cases where the artist expresses his creation using direct, typographical effects, of the kind "They were far apart". Poetry often uses such effects. I have seen a poetry collection where a poem was written one letter to a page (in a font size filling the pages) - the artistic effect would definitely be reduced if the text was printed in normal type.

A choice of typeface etc. is *usually* not information-bearing; it is a simple "wrapper" for the information. But when an artist *gives* it a meaning, by expressing his message through explicit choice of a "typographical language", those typographical elements conveying part of the message, conceptually becomes part of the Expression. The expression is sort of like a graphical artwork (blended with a text artwork) - and it still is Expression.

But these are rather exceptional cases. Usually, the manuscript conveys its semantic content without requiring one specific rendering of it.

> > So, the manuscript has only those "general, common properties of a set of [future manifestation] objects" (in the sense of *significant* properties) - it *is* an Expression, not a Manifestation.

> It is also an 'expression', yes ! But ...

> We agree that W - E - M hierarchy is a suite of abstractions, reified in specific kinds of records. OK. But this abstraction process starts from the 'item' in hand (the concrete entity), and goes I -> M -> E -> W !

Actually, the real world entities tend to enter the world in exactly the opposite order. :-)

> Thus, I can't jump - within the abstraction process - directly from 'item' to 'expression'. I speak for myself :-)

I never meant to skip abstraction levels.

Well... Now that I think of it: What's wrong with that, from a philosophical point of view? If you are in a specific situation where the properties that distinguishes different Manifestation is of no interest at all, you might peel off all those uninteresting properties in one step, rather than two. If I build a full text index for a number of digital books, which each may be available in HTML, PDF and MS Word formats, the index could return a hit list indicating the Expression, rather than the Manifestation, abstraction of the Item(s) in which the search terms were found. The Manifestation properties are not significant until the user decides to view one of the documents, which is completely independent of the full text search operation.

But I certainly agree that the Manifestation level *exists* for all items, (or rather: must exist at the time an Item exemplification is generated) even if we in a given situation may jump over it.

I think our disagreement is whether a materialization is necessarily an Item, from a modelling point of view. I say "No - Manifestation, Expressions and Works *may* materialize as well".

We can see it from another side as well: An Item certainly isn't always material. One material object may "be" an Item, not because of its material existence, but because of its location and orientation. Rearrange the material objects, and you have another document. (Dig up the old Scrabble game...)

Some Items are ephemeral, at different levels: A web page viewed on a screen appears and disappears "forever" a few seconds later. Surely, an HTML file may exist, but the HTML file is not the Item you read - it contains the parameters (in the form of HTML tags) for *generating* an Item, but the Item is generated by the browser. The HTML even defines the Manifestation parameters in an incomplete manner: The actual choice of e.g. typeface and other presentation attributes depend on available typefaces at the client workstation, the screen/window size etc. When we are talking about printed books, the manifestation is defined by the parameters determining the document presentation, and this should be no different for digital documents.

Some web documents don't have any HTML file, either: A web document may be a web camera image which conceptually disappears the very moment it is displayed. (Technically, it exists for 1/25 sec or thereabouts, but from a modelling point of view, that should certainly be ignored.) I am rather reluctant to consider this a "materialized" document copy, but it *is* an Item (in my view of the world).

FRBR Listserv Archive

> When I act as a cataloguer (it happens from time to time :-), I behave like this.
> What do you think ?

Now we are turning to another set of questions...

Obviously, bibliographical cataloguing of traditional media goes from Item and up the steps. But that doesn't mean that **all** the catalog information comes from the Item you are handling. E.g. the real name of an author writing under an artist name may be known from some other source, which is not necessarily another Item. The same applies to e.g. geographical location of the publisher, which is not always available in the Item itself. But it **is** added to the Manifestation description (maybe indirectly, through a reference to an authority record).

So, we do accept information which does not originate in the Item but applies to the Manifestation, Expression and Work. I want to recognize this fully, by accepting materializations of these entities in their entirety. Note that I am not talking about **descriptions** of these entities - I recognize the materializations as real world phenomena.

We have a tradition for cataloguing our holdings (only) - we **require** an item before we start doing anything at all. But then... We are willing to make a bibliographical description of a continuing resource, such as a weekly periodical, based on a single issue. After a year, 98% of the document has been catalogued without being seen by a librarian! So to some degree, the principle of cataloguing holdings only is being watered out by continuing resources such as serials.

Streaming media makes matter even worse: With a traditional CR document, you can at least go back to that (/those) issue(s) that were the basis for the bibliographical description. For a streaming web TV or web radio channel you can't. Even web newspapers, superficially looking like their paper counterparts, turn out to be much more like a radio/TV channel: Any access is likely to generate an Item that has never before been seen, and never will be seen again. (Web newspapers typically update their front page every few seconds.) Capturing and preserving a web newspaper through all its changes is not realistic, as a general solution.

So: Should we continue to describe web radio/TV/newspaper documents based on an Item? Or should we search for other descriptions? Maybe the description should be viewed as a **stream**, described by the stream characteristics, its profile over time, rather than by static properties of a random snapshot? We haven't come too far in analyzing how streaming resources should be handled, neither the real world object nor the bibliographical description of it. In fact, streaming resources are not currently recognized as a class of continuing resource at all; it must be modelled as either a serial or as an integrating resource - and it is neither.

For selected streaming resources, we are in fact capturing the entire stream here at the National Library of Norway: Several of the Norwegian public radio channels are stored in their entirety in our digital archive. (Note that capturing on disk or tape actually changes the nature of the information, from having streaming properties to having monograph properties, but that's the only way we **can** preserve it!)

For streaming web newspapers, we have limited our capturing to daily, static snapshots at the Item level. For a number of newspapers, we have made agreements with the publishers to deliver the continuous stream of newspaper articles as they are entered into the (continuously changing) database from which the web pages are generated. The delivery is made at a "manuscript" level: All the text is there, the markup indicates conceptual properties like "headline", "ingress", "main text" etc, but with no indications of specific layout, how to format the text into the web page columns etc. (There are indications of "importance", affecting the placement of a story on the front page relative to other stories, but the final placement is done when the article is read from the database, not when written into the base.)

When we retrieve these newspaper articles for viewing, we must supply all details of presentation, by using the article text (which is in a format defined by an XML DTD) as input to an XSLT engine, much like the phototypesetter of a publishing house, generating an HTML document that can be viewed using a standard web browser.

Each snapshot may be viewed as a new issue of a serial issue, as long as we've got no better alternative. I don't think that is a very good alternative, though. But how will you catalogue the article stream that we receive as they are entered into the database in manuscript form? Will you consider each article to be an Item entity, too? They never were viewed as Item entities in the form we receive them. I think it is appropriate to catalog these at Expression level (only), and to treat the stream as one streaming entity, not as thousands of distinct articles. (Well... if resources

FRBR Listserv Archive

allow - but they don't - you could analyze the stream, breaking it down into separate entries, similar to the analysis of other periodicals. But like the periodical should be described as such, not only by the individual articles published in it, the stream should be described as a stream, too.)

We will base the full text search index on the article stream, at Expression level. When the user selects one of the hits for viewing, we generate on the fly e.g. an HTML Manifestation, or some other format. We might even generate a physical Item, by sending the newly formatted text to a printer. Once done, both the Item (if electronic) and Manifestation disappears, only the Expression remains.

If the article text, which I view as an Expression, were to be treated as an Item, what would the "philosophical" implications of that be? I would be using an *Item* as input to a process generating a Manifestation... That doesn't sound right to me. A Manifestation is based on an Expression, not on an Item.

What is the principal difference between an author's typewritten manuscript and our digital text? Would it be different if the author delivered his manuscript as a digital file, as an email appendix? I think not.

Sorry for getting carried away - I address such a wide range of questions in this posting that it really should have been split into at least four parts! (So, feel free to comment on only a few of the questions.)

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Martin Doerr, 23/01/2004, 11:42

Re: Still Fighting with Movie Expressions

Dear Ketil,

I agree with your view that Expression is a kind of abstraction. As I have pointed out in my previous message, the kind of common properties you look at are dictated by the function you would like to achieve.

I am not very fond of the definition of abstraction you cite. This poses a philosophical problem, which is crucial to the whole discussion here: Is there an absolute, objective measure to say what "detail" means, and which properties exist, and then which are common? I would say no, there is no such thing. Any detail can be important for the one purpose, and be "detail" for another. Any property we can formally state is a parameter in a theory, e.g. "this envelope is red" is a product of a complex innate algorithm of our image processing unit in our brain (see e.g. "An Anthropologist on the Moon" by the neurologist Oliver Sacks).

I think the definition by Tsichritzis e.al. is meaningless without mentioning the intended function and the cognitive theory that allows to generate parameters.

Even though we can regard WEMI as an "abstraction hierarchy", I would like to note that the abstraction mechanisms between the levels are not the same, and therefore it does not share all properties of ISA (BT/NT) or part_of hierarchies:

I regard:

* Item as INSTANTIATION of Manifestation, and Manifestation a CLASS of Items, may only one.

* Expression as an EQUIVALENCE CLASS of Manifestations with respect to the symmetric relation of exhibiting common properties we are interested in (needs saying for what). It is equally possible to regard Expression as an EQUIVALENCE CLASS of all Items of multiple Manifestations, with respect to the symmetric relation of exhibiting common properties we are interested in, and which are part of the INTENTION of Manifestation. (I also regard a manuscript as yet another Manifestation of the respective Expression with a single Item).

* Following Richard Smiraglia, I regard "Work" as an EQUIVALENCE CLASS of an aggregation of Expressions, with respect to the ASYMMETRIC relation of various derivation processes we are interested in (again needs saying for what).

The above can be used to create an ontological theory of FRBR and to solve the problems of distinguishing between the levels.

Best,

Martin

FRBR Listserv Archive

Ralph Papakhian, 23/01/2004, 16:10

Re: Modelling/representing entities above Item (was:Still Fighting with Movie Expressions)

hi,

there are 8 definitions for "expression" in the OED (one of which is "manifestation"). which definition is frbr using?

A. Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University Music Library

Morbus Iff, 24/01/2004, 15:34

Re: [ANN] LibDB - FRBR'd Library Management System

I'd like to introduce my latest project, LibDB:

An open-sourced Perl/MySQL library and asset management system based on and inspired by the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, triples from the semantic web, and "the end-user doesn't, and shouldn't, need to know this stuff". In English, this means that you'll be able to smartly and easily catalog your movies, books, magazines, comics, etc. into your own computerized "personal library".

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/>

This has been a dream project for quite a while, something that I've always wanted for my own rather large collection of "stuff". I needed the "perfect" system, as it were, because I didn't want to end up cataloguing everything twice, or having to write conversion scripts from one failed undertaking to another.

And so, a few months back, I gave myself 180 days to research the "proper" way of cataloguing media, delving headfirst into librarian technologies. That six months of planned research was cut abruptly short by a sudden need for results, and thus, LibDB was quickly born. Three weeks ago, it didn't exist. Now, there's a strong set of Project Goals, a Database Schema with sample data, a planned File Structure, and I'm beginning to work on the installation code so that, from the very beginning, things are drop-dead simple to get going.

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/?ProjectGoals>

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/?DatabaseSchema>

<http://www.disobey.com/noos/LibDB/?FileStructure>

"Drop-dead simple" ("drop-dread simple", as I like to call the projects that purport ease of use, but fail miserably) will mean different things to different people, and I've focused the development on three user profiles: casual, discriminating, and expert, which you can read more about in the Project Goals.

LibDB is based around the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, a relatively new (1997) whitepaper in the librarian world that many have heralded as the next big thing in cataloguing. Art Rhyno, author of Using Open Source Systems for Digital Libraries and head librarian at the University of Windsor called his initial peek at LibDB "really impressive", and that I'm "the only developer working on FRBR from a practical systems perspective right now".

LibDB, as all of my projects, is designed from the very beginning for extensibility: users will be able to add their own locations ("where is this item stored?"), their own identifiers ("my local naming scheme is MORBUS1231"), and their own annotations (name/value pairs like "Review: 3 stars", "Death By: Axe to Head", etc.). Likewise, it'll allow granularity in how much you actually want to catalog: if you want to keep track of who catered a movie or who bound a book, have a blast. If you want to show all the comic books you have that contained the character "Sherlock Holmes" and touched on the concept of "murder", you can do that too. They'll be a number of pre-built identifiers (UPC, ASIN, IMDb, ISBN, etc.), roles (Director, Writer, Special Effects, etc.), and annotations (Chapters, Review, Summary, etc.) as well.

LibDB is still very early in its development (not a bit of code has been written, only data modeling and similar preparation) so you've got the welcome ability to influence the future of the cataloguing program "you've always wanted".

And yes, it'll be free, yes, it'll allow sharing of data (in varying forms: MARC, RDF, and MODS are initially planned), and yes, they'll be permaURLs and RESTian architecture. If you have no clue what I'm talking about, that's quite all right too: you don't need to, and that's a feature.

Morbus Iff

FRBR Listserv Archive

Ketil Albertsen, 27/01/2004, 09:45

Re: Modelling/representing entities above Item (was:Still Fighting with Movie Expressions)

A. Ralph Papakhian:

> there are 8 definitions for "expression" in the OED (one of which is
> "manifestation"). which definition is frbr using?

Its own... :-)

I haven't got any OED on my bookshelf, so I cannot tell which of its eight alternatives are closest to FRBR's definition.

First and foremost, FRBR defines a *concept*, which is (in principle) independent of the label affixed to it. I guess there may have been some heated discussions in the group defining FRBR regarding the labeling - everybody agrees what it *is*, but what shall we *call* it? And they ended up with "Expression" as being the closest term they could find, which would be acceptable to the expected audience. If none of OED's 8 definitions match the FRBR concept, then there are (at least) nine definitions of the term.

Any translator of the FRBR report (or AACR2, or the ISBDs, or...) faces a similar problem: The concept is well defined, and independent of translation, but labeling it is a major problem. Dictionary based translation frequently fails. E.g. the "Item" label for the lowest abstraction level is a rather general term in the English language, which has been given a quite specific meaning in FRBR contexts. The Norwegian language already has a term which is far more specific, and quite closely matches the FRBR "Item" concept: "Eksemplar". So the translators chose to use this label rather than a dictionary translation of "Item".

The dictionary definitions of "Item" and "Eksemplar" probably differ quite a bit, but hopefully, the FRBR concept is the same whether the English or the Norwegian label is used to identify it.

Yours respectfully

Ketil Albertsen

Morbus Iff, 20/02/2004, 00:56

Re: Identifiers relate to Manifestations, except when...

In 99% of the cases I can think of, an identifier is related to a manifestation. ISBNs, ISSNs, DOIs, UPC's, Amazon ASINs, etc., etc. I haven't had any problem coming to this conclusion: identifiers should relate to the physical manifestation of the expression.

Except... when it comes to an IMDb identifier. Some of you will recognize my pseudonym from previous discussions and questions about movies under FRBR, and I've been largely silent because I'm coding like mad on the LibDB project [1]. As I was working on the identifiers interface, however, I realized that I'd like to include the IMDb identifier for a particular movie.

For example, here's a URL for a movie at IMDb: <http://imdb.com/title/tt0368296/>. The identifier is "tt0368296".

But IMDb doesn't talk about physical manifestations of movies, it talks about the movies themselves: in other words, the expression. The IMDb identifier should be related to the expression.

Does this make sense? How are other people handling identifiers? Can anyone think of similar identifiers that are better to an expression than a manifestation? If the IMDb identifier is a rarity, then I think, for now, I'll just relate them to the manifestation and jot a note down somewhere. If, however, people can think of more instances where an expression is a better relationship, I'll have to rethink some things.

[1] <http://disobey.com/noos/LibDB/>

Morbus Iff

Morbus Iff, 20/02/2004, 17:17

Re: FRBRish/LibDB chat transcript

FRBR Listserv Archive

Impromptu discussion of FRBR/LibDB on irc.freenode.net. When I'm there, I'm always in #disobey and #swhack. The unedited form is archived permanently at the following URI: <http://notabug.com/swhack/chatlogs/2004-02-20.html#T15-27-44>

<deltab> you noted that users would differ in how strictly they'd apply rules, how much they'd learn of ontologies, etc.

<Morbus> correct, yes.

<deltab> it might be a good idea to store what class of user enters data

<Morbus> so that then upper levels would be able to say "show me data from people who know what they're doing"?

<Morbus> deltab: so, you want that lvl applied to rows, not the whole db? rows would be the only way to say "show me something to fix".

<deltab> yes

<deltab> did you notice the section in FRBR about parts?

<Morbus> i've noticed the section on parts, but I don't remember it 100%. my impression on the first read through was that it was related to individual physical parts of a whole: the study guide to an english book, the troika in a music CD, etc. the parts that have been discussed on the list have been related to parts of a singular item. pg 3 through 7, minutes 6:43 to 6:59, etc. i didn't think the frbr parts dialog covered that stuff. but, again, i don't recall specifics. i've done no specific coding or development work on "parts" as a concept.

<deltab> me neither. I wanted to read that section again

<Morbus> i wanted to read a bunch of stuff about movie encoding too before i did any "real" thoughtwork on it. er, not movie encoding per se, but movie markup related stuff. i've a document somewhere that talks about movie metadata.

<deltab> you're not daunted by the potential massive scale of it? so many people, so many pieces of work assembled

<Morbus> not really. i know what i want, and i strive to get it. well, yeah, i mean, the amount of reading to be done sucks. especially considering that no one can agree on anything. but, i'm equally positive that whatever choice i make, a bunch of people are gonna say "you should use my idea instead".

<deltab> have you decided exactly what will be described and what won't?

<Morbus> ultimately, its up to the end-user, but i've modeled one of my own movies in the mysql_sample.sql the movie in the sample schema models production companies, hair and makeup assistances, and defines objects on a lievel like "swimwear". it also keeps track of the characters played by a person, and the artisan (distribution company) catalog number. i certainly don't expect "casual" users to care about that stuff. and i have no doubt that librarians aren't gonna give a crap about the "artisan catalog number".

<Morbus> how much you put in is really up to you. but the data that i've been building around as my base assumes a high level of detail. personally, for mem, i'm gonna be marking up how people die in a movie. so, my personal LibDB will include a "Death By" annotation. which will be searched/indexed/shown along with all the other annotations, etc. you'll be able to show all "death by garden tools" in "films" of the "1980s", for instance.

<deltab> I suppose even something like Darth Maul's contact lenses could be considered works,

<Morbus> well, the user could do that if they wanted. i'm certainly not going to stop them. but it doesn't make any goddamn sense.

<deltab> it might for the designer :-)

<Morbus> it doesn't fit well in the frbr model, and it doesn't have any true identifiers (unless you consider retail model number duplicates, patent numbers, etc.) but, yeah, if you wanted to make a contact lense database, sorted by color (concepts), objects (stars, spirals, cats eye), or event (halloween, swimming), you could do that.

<deltab> and have them connected to the films in which they're used?

<Morbus> deltab: yes, because you'd be able to define a) relationship types ("ie. film prop") and b) relationship ("this WORK is a FILMPROP of WORK")

<deltab> so it could get arbitrarily complex nice in theory, but could chew up lots of time

<Morbus> yes. the user determines how complex. [chewing up lots of time] doesn't sound any different from any other metadata-galore system though. i think the only people

FRBR Listserv Archive

who would truly *use* *use* the metadata system would be the second level of user. the first (casual) user wouldn't want to put that much effort in. the third (librarian) wouldn't have TIME to put that much effort in. so only the second (discriminating) user would attempt to. but, that's not to say that it won't be possible for the other users.

<sbp> so it'd be nice if you could search within the labels that you put in. will you allow that? so all deaths that contain the word "garden", etc.

<Morbus> sbp; yes, that'd be possible. annotations can be searched by. i don't have any plans (yet) to make a topic map interface, but the db supports it. a concept can have a relationship to another concept. so, the "Rake" object could be a RT to the "Garden Tool" object. you'd then be able to browse objects, concepts, places, etc., in a hierarchal sense. or, show related terms on searches, in listings, etc.

Thoughts?

--

Morbus Iff

Martha Yee, 09/07/2004, 17:19

Re: UCLA Film and Television Archive on Voyager

ANNOUNCEMENT:

The UCLA Film and Television Archive has been working with the UCLA Libraries over the last year on a transition from ORION2 (TAOS) library information system software to Voyager software. As of July 7, 2004, our new Voyager OPAC is now available at:

<http://cinema.library.ucla.edu>

For general assistance in searching the catalog, please email our Research and Study Center at:

arsc@ucla.edu

For technical information on the Voyager implementation or for a detailed searching guide that gives advice on how to search on titles, credits, studios and networks, topics, historical events, forms such as animation, genres such as gangster films, and fictitious characters such as Bugs Bunny and Sherlock Holmes, please email your request to me at:

myee@ucla.edu

Our bibliographic records can now be downloaded from the Voyager catalog in MARC 21 format using Z39.50, and they are also available in MARC 21 format on RLIN.

It might be of interest to FRBR fans that we have created expression-based records for moving image materials, with manifestations in different physical formats or with minor differences in distribution information placed into MARC 21 holdings records that are attached to the appropriate expression record. We use uniform title authority records for the work entity, and make lots of cross references on our authority records from other titles under which our motion picture and television works have been released or broadcast. Unfortunately, Voyager will not allow us to display the cross references in the authority records along with the uniform titles in the bibliographic records, so users have to do two searches to assemble the work entity (the title search and the title variants search).

We would like to thank the staff of the UCLA Libraries for helping us to create such a wonderful catalog of our holdings while they were busy with their own information system software transition. In particular, we owe a debt of gratitude to Terry Ryan, Sara Shatford Layne, Bo-Gay Tong-Salvador, Andy Kohler and Cindy Kimmick for remaining cheerful, helpful and creative at all times in light of the fact that every time we worked on a different implementation issue they discovered another way that a film and television archive does things differently from the way a library does things.

Martha M. Yee

Cataloging Supervisor

UCLA Film and Television Archive

1015 N. Cahuenga Blvd.

Los Angeles, CA 90038-2635

Patrick Le Bœuf, 19/07/2004, 17:18

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: Buenos Aires Meetings

Colleagues,

The FRBR Review Group will have 2 meetings during the IFLA Conference in Buenos Aires: Saturday 21 August 8.30-10.30 (caution: this is even before the Conference actually begins!)

Friday 27 August 8.30-10.30

both of them in G. Lozada Room, Sheraton Hotel (caution: this is not the same venue as for the main Conference events).

The FRBR Working Group on the Expression entity will have 1 meeting, on Tuesday 24 August 8.30-10.30, in OMBU A, Sheraton Hotel.

The Working Group on FRBR and continuing resources will have 1 meeting, on Thursday 26 August 11.00-13.00, also in OMBU A, Sheraton Hotel.

Observers are allowed to attend the meetings within the limits of the available space in the rooms, and provided the chairs of working groups do not decide otherwise.

Besides, the FRBR bibliography has been updated and is available at <http://infoserv.inist.fr/wwsympa.fcgi/d_read/frbr/FRBR_bibliography.rtf>.

Please notify me if you have any problem in downloading that document.

Best wishes,

Patrick Le Boeuf

Chair of the IFLA FRBR Review Group

Morbus Iff, 23/07/2004, 04:59

Re: W "Forms" and the use of matching "Roles"

This is a two part question. In a Work, we have an attribute "form":

"The class to which the Work belongs (e.g., novel, play, poem, biography, symphony, concerto, map, drawing, photograph, movie script, etc.)."

The question: has anyone standardized on a set list of "form" types?

Anyone got a list of house rules they use? How is a "short story" of 4000 words different from a kid's "book" of 2000 words (assuming both have some, or no, illustrations)? What if you've got a "photograph" of a "drawing", and it's the ONLY Manifestation of said "drawing"?

I ask because of "roles". "Roles" makes a very small appearance in the FRBR spec, in 4.4.2 (the Manifestation's "statement of responsibility"):

"The statement may also indicate the role of function performed by each of the individuals, groups, or organizations responsible."

In my LibDB project, "roles" are implemented on a much grander scale.

A "role" can be related to a person ("Director", "Writer", "Hair Stylist") or a "corporate body" ("Distributor", "Special FX", "Insurance").

To start off the "roles" approach, I modeled a few movies based on data from the IMDb. Within a short period of time, I had a listing of about 90 unique "roles" that can be attached to a Work of "form" "film" (or "video"; I'm not sure which is better just yet, but "movie" has been ruled out already for being too specific).

Showing these 90 "roles" in a dropdown menu (for example) is nice and simple, IF the user is constantly adding "films" to their database.

However, if the user ever adds a "comic book" (for example), they have to search through 90 (or more) unrelated "roles" to find the one they care about ("Inker").

The solution was to assign certain "roles" to a specific Work "form", such that you'd only see the 90 "film" "roles" if the user has previously indicated that a Work is a "film". On the other hand, if the Work is a "graphic novel" (a "form" that I'm using loosely to describe comics and their inevitable collection-into-book-form), then they'd only see ten or so different related "roles".

In some cases, "roles" would have no forced "form" - a "Writer" can apply to most Work "forms" ("script", "comic", "film", "book", etc.).

The big problem with all this is having (or not having, in this case) a collection of known Work "forms" that I can assign "roles" too. 99% of "roles" assigned to a "book" would also be assigned to a "short story", "poetry". They wouldn't necessarily apply to "haiku".

Thoughts from the insanely quiet mailing list? [Incidentally, there's a side note for you: if FRBR is so great and magical, how come we're not talking about it? Are people

FRBR Listserv Archive

waiting for someone else to stun them with an implementation, or is an objectified (as opposed to E-R) approach the saving grace?]
Morbus Iff

Maja Žumer, 23/07/2004, 12:35

Re: W "Forms" and the use of matching "Roles"

Hello!

The reason for apparent inactivity of the FRBR list may be that it is too hot :-) At the moment the temperature is 35 in Ljubljana and humid!

But back to the serious i.e. FRBR matters. Regarding 'form of work': as you may have seen in the FRBR/CRM Heraklion meeting report, we already discussed the issue and decided that it is not a work attribute, but a constraining super-type of the work or, rather, type of Representative expression. (Martin, did I get this right?). Which does not mean that a list of 'form' types is not needed to enable effective searching. Which answers the first question. If it is useful (important, meaningful...) for the intended users to differentiate between a short story and a kids' book, then you should be able to do so.

Regarding the roles: I agree that they are important and dependent on the form, but I definitely do not see them as a work attribute. The role (or relator code or however we want to call it) is just a type of 'is created by' relationship.

Best regards

Maja

Patrick Le Boeuf, 23/07/2004, 13:29

Re: W "Forms" and the use of matching "Roles"

To explicate a bit more in detail what Maja meant:

The WG on FRBR/CRM Harmonization, while striving to "translate" FRBR into OO formalism, has been thinking about the "form" attribute, assigned to the Work entity in the FRBR Final Report. The reasoning was as follows: a Work is "an abstract entity, there is no single material object one can point to as the work" (FRBR Final Report p. 16); a work can therefore definitely *not* have a "form". In order to "grasp" the work, you must have access to at least an Expression, which in turn can be grasped IFF (no pun intended...) a Manifestation thereof is available. The Manifestation can be perceived by the senses, and the information received by our senses allows us to analyze and typify or categorize the Expression embodied in the Manifestation; among the typification possibilities, there is a typification by "form": "I recognize this as being text" (at a very general level), "I recognize this as being a theatre script, a prose poem, a haiku, a short novel (etc.)" (at a more specific level). Among all the possible expressions for a given work, you have to choose one as being best "representative" for the work, and the "form" of that "representative expression" is then supposed to be the "constraining super-type of the work", that is: "if an expression does not fit in this category, then it is an expression of another work". For instance: in the FRBR conventions, an adaptation of a novel into a children's book is supposed to be another work (p. 17; I've always found that questionable, but that's another issue). This means that the novel has a "representative expression" which has as constraining super-type: "text - novel"; then you compare the expression embodied in the children's book (which has as form: "text - novel for children") to that representative expression and you find out that they are different. Of course, an authoritative list for "constraining super-types" of works is dramatically important in that process, because this is what will determine your cataloging conventions and demarcating lines between works. If I do not declare "text - novel for children" as a distinct "constraining super-type", but only "text - novel", then a novel adapted for children will remain just an expression of the novel as a work, not a new work. This flexibility was intended in the FRBR model, as no one in the world can positively say "This is not the same work" (it's basically just a matter of taste...).

The FRBR Final Report doesn't have any "authoritative list" of possible values for the attribute "form of a Work", nor will the FRBR/CRM Harmonization WG develop any "authoritative list" for the possible values for "constraining super-type of Work", as

FRBR Listserv Archive

it is not the intention when developing a conceptual model. But an operational data model certainly should have such authoritative lists.

To answer Morbus' question: I think that the institution that has developed the closest thing to what he needs is the AustLit Gateway Team. Do not hesitate to contact Kerry Kilner or Kent Fitch or Carol Hetherington on my behalf. They are subscribers of this listserv and can be contacted at frbr@nla.gov.au. But AustLit Gateway is only concerned with literary textual works, not with audiovisual materials. They have developed an authoritative list for Work types (<http://www.austlit.edu.au/common/manual/AuthorityLists.html#WorkTypeTerms>), Form terms (<http://www.austlit.edu.au/common/manual/AuthorityLists.html#FormTerms>), and Genre terms (<http://www.austlit.edu.au/common/manual/AuthorityLists.html#GenreTerms>).

As to roles: as Maja already said, this a typification of a relationship. Relator codes in MARC formats are a better, more accurate and more consistent "authoritative list" for such types as the mishmash, unreliable information that you can get from the "statement of responsibility" attribute - the OCLC Research Team won't contradict me... If Morbus needs it, it would be theoretically possible to develop controlled authoritative lists with extraordinary subtle constraining conditions: "IF Work has type = soandso THEN participated-in-creation-of-Work relationship CANNOT have type = blablabla". Good luck...

Best wishes,
Patrick

Morbus Iff, 23/07/2004, 17:56

Re: W "Forms" and the use of matching "Roles"

From: Maja Žumer <Maja.Zumer@nuk.uni-lj.si> on the FRBR list:
>But back to the serious i.e. FRBR matters. Regarding 'form of
>work': as you may have seen in the FRBR/CRM Heraklion meeting
>report, we already discussed the issue and decided that it is not
>a work attribute, but a constraining super-type of the work or,
>rather, type of Representative expression. (Martin, did I get

This I didn't know - thanks for the update. It would seem, then, that one possible solution to my problem ("how should I restrict the display of roles based on the type of work being added") would be to create a hierarchical taxonomy of types, such that a "super type" of "text" (for example) would encompass the more specific types of "book" and "poem". A very rough sketch:

text > (book, children's book, short story, poem)

video > (animation, stop motion, documentary, news reel)

Then, instead of roles being specific to a "book", they'd be specific to a "text" type (thus, being inherited for short stories, poems, and so on and so forth).

My current data model for LibDB has no way of storing these "super-types", so I'll have to revisit it with that in mind.

From: PATRICK.LE-BOEUF@bnf.fr on the FRBR list:

>To answer Morbus' question: I think that the institution that has developed
>the closes thing to what he needs is the AustLit Gateway Team. Do not
>hesitate to contact Kerry Kilner or Kent Fitch or Carol Hetherington on my
>behalf. They are subscribers of this listserv and can be contacted at
>frbr@nla.gov.au. But AustLit Gateway is only concerned with literary
>textual works, not with audiovisual materials. They have developed an
>authoritative list for:
><http://www.austlit.edu.au/common/manual/AuthorityLists.html#WorkTypeTerms>
><http://www.austlit.edu.au/common/manual/AuthorityLists.html#FormTerms>
><http://www.austlit.edu.au/common/manual/AuthorityLists.html#GenreTerms>

From: Bruce D'Arcus <bdarcus@fastmail.fm> on the LibDB-develop list:

><http://www.loc.gov/marc/sourcecode/genre/genrelist.html>

><http://www.loc.gov/marc/sourcecode/form/formlist.html>

These URLs have been very helpful!

FRBR Listserv Archive

From a semantic standpoint, is there any consensus on terms here? Is the "form" of a Work turning into a "super-type"? And is AustLit's "Genre" really matches for the Group 3 Concept? And is MARC's "Genre" the equivalent of the FRBR/CRM's "super-type"?
Morbus Iff (you, me, eropuri? aawwwwwWWWW yYeahhhHHAhhh)

Morbus Iff, 24/07/2004, 02:12

Re: W "Forms" and the use of matching "Roles"

Some /very/ interesting thoughts from my LibDB mailing list:

At 3:19 PM -0700 7/23/04, Richard Acero wrote:

>I believe that the "Super-type" would be the best
>option to enforce. As far as "defining" "Super-types"
>look no further than the Copyright Office's website.
>"Insanity!", you say? Wait, hear me out. The Copyright
>office's registration forms have their own
>"super-types":
>Literary works: <http://www.copyright.gov/register/literary.html>
>Visual arts: <http://www.copyright.gov/register/visual.html>
>Performing arts: <http://www.copyright.gov/register/performing.html>
>Sound recordings: <http://www.copyright.gov/register/sound.html>
>Serials/Periodicals: <http://www.copyright.gov/register/serial.html>
>Each of these "super-types" have their own criteria
>for whether or not a given work constitutes inclusion
>within a particular "super-type".
>For example:
>>From the Copyright Office's site:
>Examples of literary works:
><i>fiction, nonfiction, manuscripts, poetry,
>contributions to collective works, compilations of
>data or other literary subject matter, dissertations,
>theses, reports, speeches, bound or looseleaf volumes,
>secure tests, pamphlets, brochures, textbooks, online
>works, reference works, directories, catalogs,
>advertising copy, single pages of text, tracts, games,
>automated databases, computer programs</i>
>You will notice plays, scripts, screenplays, and
>dramas all missing from the Literary Work
>"super-type". That is because they are classified
>under Performing Arts.
>Soooooooooo...
>Playwrights, and Screenwriters "roles" would be
>restricted to "works" that fell under the Performing
>Arts "super-type". I think this alternative could
>provide the clarification of roles within works that
>you were seeking.

Morbus Iff (i subscribe to the theory of intellectual osmosis)

Martha Yee, 22/09/2004, 18:43

Re: UCLA Film and Television Archive Cataloging Procedure Manual available

As I indicated in an earlier posting, the UCLA Film and Television Archive creates work-based authority records for moving image works, expression-based bibliographic records, and manifestation-based holdings records. For those who are interested in the details, the UCLA Film and Television Archive's Cataloging Procedure Manual (CPM) is now available on the Archive's web site at:

<http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/CPM%20Voyager/CPMV00TofC.html>

We use a combination of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed. rev. (AACR2R) and Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual (AMIM2) rules, Library of Congress subject headings (LCSH) and Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms (MIM) genre and form terms in MARC 21 format records on Voyager. The procedure manual indicates which rules we are following in any given situation and contains many examples. In

FRBR Listserv Archive

addition, the CPM contains local rules for uniform titles, supplied titles, local subject headings and genre/form terms, and terms for use in the physical description of archival moving image materials, with an extensive glossary of the latter, including suggested MARC 21 coding. The glossary in particular might be useful to institutions that deal on an occasional basis with film or video.

Martha M. Yee
Cataloging Supervisor

Cathy Weng, 30/09/2004, 18:26
Re: Translating FRBR Final Report

Dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to announce that my colleague I-Chene Tai (Le Moyne College, Syracuse, NY) and I have been granted the permission from IFLA to translate the 1998 FRBR Final Report into Chinese.

I-Chene and I were in Taipei for a workshop this past summer. We had a chance speaking to many information professionals in Taiwan. During our conversation we discovered that very few people understood FRBR model and there weren't many documentation in Chinese on this topic. Since FRBR model was aimed to reach the global information community, a good documentation in Chinese will be a good start. That's how we decided to do this outreach project.

The final product will be in both traditional and simplified Chinese. We plan to finish the draft document by the end of 2005 and finalize it by spring 2006. We will appreciate any suggestions or advices you might have. Thanks!

Cathy Weng
Head of Cataloging
Roscoe L. West Library
The College of New Jersey

Patrick Le Boeuf, 10/11/2004, 13:07
Re: Meeting Report

Dear all,

Here is - at last! - the report on the FRBR Review Group's meeting in Buenos Aires last August during the IFLA Conference. This report will be posted on the FRBR Review Group's Web pages very soon. I apologize for the delaying.

Best wishes,
Patrick Le Boeuf
(See attached file: FRBRRG_20040827_Report.zip)

Glenn Patton, 16/11/2004, 16:52
Re: The OCLC Top 1000

Dear FRBR colleagues,

I wanted to call your attention to a new FRBR-related project that's been added this week to the OCLC Office of Research's web site, the OCLC Top 1000 (<http://www.oclc.org/research/top1000/default.htm>). It's a list of the top 1000 titles owned by OCLC member libraries. The list was created using the Office of Research's FRBR algorithm.

--Glenn

Roberto Sturman, 24/11/2004, 08:47
Re: IFPA (ISIS FRBR Prototype Application)

Hi everybody,

The WEB search interface of the ISIS FRBR Prototype Application is now on-line:

<<http://pclub3.ts.infn.it/frbr/wwwisis/FRB2.01/FORM.HTM>>

A brief WEB page about the software - with some links - can be found at:

FRBR Listserv Archive

<<http://pclub3.ts.infn.it/frbr/FRBR.htm>>

Please note the server performance is very poor, so be prepared!

Roberto Sturman

Universita' degli Studi di Trieste
Dipartimento di Fisica
BIBLIOTECA - THE LIBRARY
Via A.Valerio 2
34127 TRIESTE
ITALY

Morbus Iff, 29/11/2004, 16:05

Re: LibDB: Embarrassing UberAlpha Available

With the sole intent of showing /something/, I've decided to let you all know about the latest with LibDB, my open sourced (MySQL and PHP) OPAC that is founded on the FRBR Final Report. Those with particularly acute memories may vaguely recall something about this very early in the year.

First, LibDB is no longer a standalone application: it has not been integrated with the Drupal content management system (CMS). Drupal is also an open sourced (MySQL and PHP) application, and provides all the "other stuff" that any web site or service generally needs: content creation and document workflow, user management and access permissions, internationalization and translation, forums, aggregators, and blah blah blah. I felt that LibDB becoming an OPAC/CMS was more important than it being merely an OPAC. You can find more about Drupal, LibDB, and Why I Chose Drupal at the following URLs:

<http://www.drupal.org/>

<http://www.libdb.com/>

http://www.libdb.com/why_drupal

The new LibDB.com web site is also of interest: it is a full Drupal site with, more importantly, a very very very early version of LibDB installed. This version does absolutely nothing /useful/, and it is with some embarrassment that I show it to you: I generally only like to unveil "WOW!" work, and not my in-progress stuff.

To play with the LibDB uberAlpha:

- * sign up for an account at LibDB.com (which is running Drupal).

- * go to the "administer" menu and choose "libdb".

In this very early version, there are only two goals:

- * represent "as little as possible" to get record manipulation working (this means that you'll only see G2 "Person" and no "Corporate Body", and only G1's "Manifestation" and no other G1 Entities).

- * get an administrative editing interface going, i.e., nothing that the public would ever want to browse through.

It is very, very rough. I can't stress this enough. Out of a 100% project, I'm saying maybe barely 5% or 10% is finished. Of particular warning is that you can add a new record but you can't go in and edit it (this is one of the final things I've to do before moving on to the next big part: some sort of browsable public interface). The only things currently editable are all the individual parts: the Persons, Group 3 Entities, Other Data Types and so forth.

To stay notified of LibDB updates:

- * create an account.

- * go to "my account"

- * choose "my notify settings"

I'll still be posting news to this list, but it'll be more Milestone or Theory related, and not all the interim minor updates. The next major steps of the LibDB project include:

- * finish the administrative record editing interface.

- * re-examine the database schema (<http://www.libdb.com/node/2>) and update it according to all the comments since its initial creation: FRBR super-types, handling dates, the variant table, etc., etc.

- * implement those database changes and update the editing code.

- * create some sort of browsing interface.

Morbus Iff

FRBR Listserv Archive

Morbus Iff, 29/11/2004, 16:34

Re: [Fwd: [libdb-develop] FRBR paper uses wrong word?]

Someone interested in LibDB had this to say regarding the FRBR Final Report:

----- Original Message -----

Subject: [libdb-develop] FRBR paper uses wrong word?

Date: Fri, 5 Nov 2004 03:39:27 -0600

From: Terry Hancock <hancock@anansinspaceworks.com>

Reply-To: hancock@anansinspaceworks.com

To: libdb-develop@lists.sourceforge.net

I also wanted to mention an oddity about the FRBR paper that you referred me to. There is a bizarre blunder in this paper in the (mis-)usage of the word "Equinox". Apparently the author has confused it with the word "Epoch", i.e.:

"Equinox" has three meanings: 1) one of the two days of the year when the night is (nearly) the same length as the day, 2) an instant in time when the Earth's rotational pole is exactly perpendicular to the vector from the Earth's core to the Sun's core (which occurs on those days), 3) one of the two points in space where the ecliptic crosses the equator.

"Epoch" is an absolute instant in time used as a reference point. Usually distinguished from "Interval", being the time between two instants, or between an instant and the epoch.

I believe that "Epoch" should be substituted for the word "Equinox" throughout this paper. And I'm a little mystified that this did not get caught in peer-review of the paper. How much review has this paper seen?

I do hope that the world does not accept FRBR as a standard with this mistake uncorrected! :-0

Cheers,

Terry Hancock

Barbara Tillett, 29/11/2004, 17:27

Re: [Fwd: [libdb-develop] FRBR paper uses wrong word?]

Just wanted to point out in cartographic cataloging that the equinox is expressed as a year that is given following coordinates for celestial charts, and in Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules one may also add a statement of the epoch when it differs from the equinox. The definition of equinox is indeed the third one listed by your colleague below. Actually in the Cartographic materials, 2nd edition the definition as taken from the United States Defense Mapping Agency is: "One of two points of intersection of the ecliptic and the celestial equator, occupied by the sun when its declination is 0 degrees." And the rules go on to say this is recorded as a year.

There is no confusion with the word epoch.

You may wish to see an example under AACR2 rule 3.3D2. I can't do superscripts with this email message...

FRBR has it right (see 4.2.12 where it is defined). - Barbara Tillett

Eeva Murtomaa, 23/04/2005, 18:09

Re: [FRBR] Satellite meeting on FRBR

(sorry for cross-postings!)

Dear colleagues,

don't miss the early bird registration dead line for the satellite meeting "Bibliotheca Universalis - How to Organize Chaos"! It will be organised in Järvenpää, Finland, on 11-12 August 2005. It is one of the satellite meetings of the Oslo World Library and Information Congress.

The aim of this satellite meeting is to extend the present FRBR and FRAR situation outside the circle of the enthusiasts, and show the significant potentials in sharing information through the FRBR ideas. In the seminar, the background and many practical implementations will be presented.

FRBR Listserv Archive

"FRBR" stands for Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records, and "FRANAR/FRAR" for Functional Requirements for Authority Records. They offer possibilities to improve the service level of libraries, but are also a significant professional challenge. We have been fortunate to get many top speakers on the subject, so the satellite meeting will be well worth attending.

Please see the program and background information at our Web site:
<http://www.kaapeli.fi/~fla/frbr05/>

You are welcome to learn more about FRBR and its effects!

Eeva Murtomaa, member of the organizing team
Librarian

Helsinki University Library - Finnish National Library

Miriam Nauri, 11/05/2005, 10:15

Re: [FRBR] Collections 2

Colleagues,

I am sorry for having missed that there indeed is a subfield for statement of responsibility in the 505-field. Still, most systems do not put information from the contents notes in the indexes. Nor is it possible to connect these titles to an authority record.

Another question that regards collections, and that was touched upon at the FRBR-workshop at OCLC last week, is whether titles of collections should be regarded as work-titles or manifestation-titles. I would like thoughts on this matter as well!

Miriam Nauri

Dan Matei, 11/05/2005, 10:54

Re: [FRBR] Collections 2

For our catalogue we decided to "extend" FRBR model a bit and (re)invent a "group" entity, which can have several flavours: series, serial, periodical, collection etc.

So:

- "A la recherche du temps perdu" is a "group" (i.e. cicle) of works;
- "New York Review of Books" is a "group" (i.e. periodical) of manifestations (no 1/2000, ... no 12/2005...);
- a "colligat" is a "group" of items bounded together;
- "IFLA Publications" of Saur is a "group" (i.e. series) of manifestations;

and so on.

This solution (cawardly) avoids the metaphysical problem of "what is a collection" (I leave that to Plato - but I can bet what his answer will be :-).

Dan Matei, director

CIMEC - Institutul de Memorie Culturala [Institute for Cultural Memory]

Miriam Nauri, 11/05/2005, 11:27

Re: [FRBR] Collections 1

Dear Colleagues in FRBR,

I suspect that my first posting did not go through, so I am sending it again (in slightly modified form). I apologize if you receive it twice!

I would like to have your input regarding a question that has come up during our work with the Royal Library's FRBR-project "SveLitt". The aim of the project is, in short, to enrich existing MARC-records in our national OPAC so that the information in them can be used for a "frbrization". At the moment, we have restricted our experiments to the records describing the works of Selma Lagerlöf (Nobel Prize winner of 1909), but we hope to extend our efforts to other Swedish authors in the future.

My question concerns how to treat collections of her work. As we want to give all her short stories work-status, we need to record the titles of the short stories in the records for the collections of short stories. According to current cataloguing rules we would need to record the titles BOTH in a contents note (field 505) AND as added entries, in order to follow the rule that all entries must be grounded in the descriptive fields. But this makes little sense in a modern OPAC context, as all

FRBR Listserv Archive

fields could be seen equally as entries and descriptions. Moreover, this doubling of information is exactly one of the things that we hope that the FRBR-model will help to abolish.

New cataloguing rules are on the way, but we will have to wait another couple of years until those will be published. In the meantime, we would like to come with a practical solution to our problem with the collecitons. If we stick to the current cataloguing rules we could make contents notes and skip the added entries. However, field 505 is not connected to the authority file. Thus some of us think that it would be better to record only the added entries in 700 a+t fields, but this would go against cataloguing rules...

Opinions on this matter will be greatly appreciated!

Miriam Nauri

Section of Bibliographic Development and Coordination
Royal Library - National Library of Sweden

Victoria Frâncu, 11/05/2005, 12:43

Re: [FRBR] Collections 2

Hello!

Congratulations on your experiment!

Considering the paragraph cited below (i.e. number 3.2.1 from the Final Report of the IFLA Study Group on the FRBR, 1998, p. 18), I would say that titles of collections should be regarded as work-titles, grouping related expressions. Moreover, the attributes of a work, more than those of a manifestation make me say it.

"Relating expressions of a work indirectly by relating each expression to the work that it realizes is often the most efficient means of grouping related expressions. In effect, the name we give to the work serves as the name for the entire set or group of expressions that are realizations of the same intellectual or artistic creation (e.g., Lancelot du Lac). It is the entity defined as work, therefore, that provides us with this grouping capability."

Best regards and success,

Victoria Frâncu

Biblioteca Centrala Universitara
Bucuresti - ROMANIA

John Espley, 11/05/2005, 19:40

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

It seems to me that a collection of short stories (either all by the same author or even different authors) should be considered a FRBR Work (with its appropriate Expression and Manifestation). And the individual stories are also individual FRBR Works. In one of my FRBR demo databases I created individual FRBR WEMI (Works, Expressions, Manifestations, Items) records for each novel and collection AND individual short stories or articles for the popular fiction writer P. C. Wren. So the short story, Fear, which appear in the Wren collection of Rough Shooting (and short story anthologies titled, Tales of fear & frightening phenomena, and The tenth Fontana book of great ghost stories, and Ghosts!) is a FRBR Work and Expression record linked to the FRBR Manifestations for the four collections. Each of the FRBR Manifestations for the collections are also linked to their own FRBR Works and Expressions.

If anybody would like to see some screen captures of these records, please email me separately since the first attempt to email this with an attachment failed.

John Espley

VTLS Inc.

Barbara B. Tillett, 12/05/2005, 00:15

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Providing only added entries and no contents note for the display may confuse users at this stage, but we could explore using the 774 (constituent unit entry). We'd need to

FRBR Listserv Archive

have some sort of print constant assigned to make it clear these were components (contents) - will require more work with MARBI. I think it would be more work for the cataloger, particularly given the fact that now many libraries rarely give added entries for things we list in contents notes. Making a separate field for each contained work is pretty labor intensive...are you sure you want us to go that direction?

The users would probably love having the added access (beyond keyword that they can get from the contents notes), but is it really worth it?

Vendors would need to agree to include the 774s as part of their OPAC displays. Just using the 700 \$a and \$t as Miriam suggested would not work, as a user really would have no clue whether the cited work was a component or just another related work or a variant citation for the manifestation being described in the 245 - with no contents note or caption or anything to indicate that it was actually one of the "contents."

There may be other solutions, but this is what occurs to me at this moment.... - Barbara Tillett

Martin Doerr, 12/05/2005, 12:52

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Dear John,

In the FRBR-CIDOC CRM harmonization discussion we take the same position:

The collection is a work making use of the collected objects. The work of the collected objects are not part of the work of collection. The collected expressions become however part of the overall expression resulting from the work of collection.

Would you support this view?

Best,

Martin

Unni Knutsen, 12/05/2005, 14:24

Re: [FRBR] Collections 1

A pragmatic solution might be not to list the titles when the collections cover all short stories or novels because a user who knows her authorship will know which titles to expect....

If the collections treat only part of her authorship within a certain genre a note would be required.

On the other hand: A programme might be developed to convert e.g. a 700\$t to a note field thus not forcing us to do double work..... The Norwegian library system BIBSYS has come up with a solution for music.

You might want to contact them for more info

Best regards,

Unni Knutsen

Oslo University College

John Espley, 12/05/2005, 15:17

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Not sure if I quite understand what you mean by "the collected expressions become however part of the overall expression resulting from the work of collection", but I certainly agree with the first part of your position.

A collection is a Work/Expression in its own right. A collection is composed of other separate Works. In the VTLIS/Virtua implementation of FRBR, the manifestation of a collection can be linked not only to the Work/Expression of the collection, but also can be linked to the Work/Expression(s) of the individual Works that make up the collection.

John Espley

VTLIS Inc.

Miriam Nauri, 12/05/2005, 15:23

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Martin and John,

One thing that I think is important to think about, if one wants to consider a collection as a work in its own right, is who is the creator of this work? When it comes to collections of a single author's work it is tempting to put the author as creator. Current cataloguing rules express this view, I believe, as the name of the author of the included works becomes the main entry and the editor an added entry. As the main entry plus the title functions as the "ID" of the work in the bibliographic record one might want to question this practice when it comes to collections.

Miriam

John Espley, 12/05/2005, 15:32

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Interesting question. If the collection is for a single author, then that author is the creator of the individual works, but is he the "creator" of the collection? If there is an editor, is the editor the creator of the collection? Or is the publisher the creator of the collection? Or should we catalog the collection as "title main entry"? Maybe we should get rid of the concept of "main entry" and just have "access points"? I don't know. I think I'll leave it up to "creators" of the cataloging rules :-)

John Espley

VTLS Inc.

Miriam Nauri, 12/05/2005, 15:41

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Barbara,

I understand your concern with putting too much work on the cataloguers. Indeed, the issue today is perhaps rather how we can put less information in our records, not more. However, I think it is important to have room for flexibility here. Our ambition is not to do this meticulous cataloguing for everything in the catalogue, but rather for a relatively small number of records for a limited number of works.

As for the future developments of the MARC format, I would wish to go to the direction of only using authority records for work-information. The relation between two related works should not be expressed in the bibliographic format at all, but in the authority format. Indeed, I have always interpreted 700 a+t added entries as expressing a relationship between a manifestation and a work, not a relationship between two works. When it comes to variant citations for the manifestations, I believe that this is expressed in field 246...?

Miriam

Miriam Nauri, 12/05/2005, 15:47

Re: [FRBR] Collections 1

Unni,

Just today we discussed a solution like the one developed by BIBSYS! We are currently not working on display, but only on pure cataloguing. However, it might be interesting for us to talk to BIBSYS at a later stage. Thank you for informing me about it.

Miriam

Martin Doerr, 12/05/2005, 17:04

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Dear Miriam, John

I would favour to get rid of the concept "main entry", but I am not a librarian. An objective rule cannot depend on if you collect from one or multiple authors.

FRBR Listserv Archive

What we have discussed in the harmonization is, that the collection, AS WELL AS the editors WORK, have their own intellectual right, independent how large or small they are, i.e. there is a conception, an implementation and may be a history of evolution. The nature of the work of collection is fundamentally different from the nature of the collected work. If there are cases, where current cataloguing practice proposes to ignore this contribution, this is not a question of concepts, i.e. "there is no such work", but a question of relevance judgement, which comes on another level.

What I meant by:

"the collected expressions become however part of the overall expression resulting from the work of collection"

Is that the work of collection and the selected expressions of the collected work form together a coherent information object, in the sense of a character sequence or image, even though the contributions are distinct. Therefore I argue that the merge is at the expression level, which then is manifested, whereas the implied works are intellectually independent.

Does that make sense?

best,
Martin

Barbara Tillett, 12/05/2005, 17:09

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

The "main entry" as such will disappear with "RDA" (Resource Description and Access - which will replace AACR), but there will still be a need to form a citation for the work embodied in the manifestation being described - we're moving to using "access points" and declaring as "primary access point" the creator of the work (or when there is none, the title of the work) - all of this is still in discussion, but thought you'd be interested in current thinking. - Barbara Tillett (Library of Congress representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR)

Martin Doerr, 12/05/2005, 17:13

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Dear All,

Just a general warning:

As an outsider, I can understand these concerns. In order to analyze what is worthwhile documenting, you have to identify the concepts in the first place. So, saying that each collection is a Work, has nothing to do with the question if this work is worth documenting.

To my opinion the messing up of both issues prevents us from understanding the underlying concepts.

This reminds me of Ranganathans classical arguments in the "Colon Classification" about the confusion of the "ideal plane, notational plane" etc..

Cataloguing rule must deal with relevance, and a conceptual model as FRBR must be independent from relevance to my opinion, because you cannot discuss the relevance of something you have declared as non-existing before-hand.

Best,
Martin

Sherman Clarke, 12/05/2005, 13:47

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

As a 30-year cataloger raised in the Anglo-American tradition of description AND access, these discussions of relying on JUST description OR access are very interesting. At the recent BIBCO Operations Committee meetings in Washington, we got an overview of the access-level bibliographic records that LC will be building for some electronic resources. We also heard about a project which proposes to build descriptive records for sound recordings with emphasis on thorough contents notes without added entries.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Whether you emphasize the added entries (which are presumably constructed using some rules and/or authority control) or contents notes (which are presumably closer to transcriptions from the resource), the redundancy is perhaps unnecessary. The possibility of building in this redundancy is probably strongest in printed materials with title pages to transcribe. Resources in other formats have less transcribable information and emphasis on access becomes even more viable. I particularly think of resources in non-verbal formats (e.g. art works, surrogate images).

On LC access-level records, see

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/reser_test.pdf and

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/access/accessrecord.html>

We also think of keyword and constructed access points as opposites. Keyword needn't imply free-for-all; keyword indexing on controlled vocabulary could be a very significant tool for access, particularly for subjects.

Sherman Clarke

NYU Libraries

John D. Byrum, 12/05/2005, 20:36

Re: [FRBR] Cataloguing of Collections

Relevant to some of the points you've raised, Sherman, is the very impressive research of Holly Yu and Margo Young, presented in their article "The Impact of Web Search Engines on Subject Searching in OPAC" (Information Technology and Libraries, Dec. 2004). After reviewing a large number of studies, they conclude: subject searching is being replaced by key-word searching and that subject searchers should select keyword rather than subject headings as their first access strategy. The article concludes with specification of needed functionality intended to enable the next generation of OPACs to respond to needs of users "who are likely to bring a mental model of Web search engines to the library catalog."

Another implication of their findings, though they don't make it, is that the catalog needs better keyword access that today's traditional descriptions provide, for example, more routine inclusion of table of contents information.

Many thanks to Miriam for initiating what has become a very interesting and informative discussion.

John D. Byrum, Jr.

Chief, Regional & Cooperative Cataloging

Library of Congress

Barbara Tillett, 12/05/2005, 21:06

[FRBR] Re: Index listing under person of principal responsibility (Was: Cataloguing of collections)

Display arrangements will depend on the search and hopefully on how the user wants to order the display. The work citation (author/title information) will still be there to use for ordering the manifestations/expressions/works under a name or subject. The citation concept remains, but the old terminology will be gone.

Music, literature, laws, and many other fields really need to collocation that citations bring - during this transition to FRBR concepts and a new cataloging code, some people may find it easier to equate "main entry" with primary access point and either a title proper or a uniform title ("citation title" as we are tentatively calling it for RDA). Our old combinations of a name/uniform title would equate with the "citation." You're not losing it for displays. - Barbara

>>> Ian Fairclough <ifairclough@marion.lib.oh.us> 05/12/05 1:33 PM >>>

Dear FRBR list readers, and others interested:

Barbara B Tillett [<mailto:btil@loc.gov>] says:

The "main entry" as such will disappear with "RDA" (Resource Description and Access - which will replace AACR)...

If main entry disappears, then, thinking in terms of a person retrieving a list of titles after executing a search by personal name: How will this list be arranged?

For musical works, the concept of main entry facilitates subarrangement under a performer's name first and then by title, rather than directly by title. For example:

FRBR Listserv Archive

the conductor-composer Leonard Bernstein didn't write a Symphony no. 5. But without due care, a recording of a performance of Beethoven's 5th under his baton might be listed under Bernstein's name with no mention of Beethoven.

Literary works may have related concerns.

Writing beautiful bibliographic records is one thing. Establishing magnificent access points is another. But how will the necessary information be arranged in a catalog display?

Sincerely - Ian

P.S. last Saturday night a lady at Big Scioty (an American contradance in Columbus, Ohio, www.bigscioty.com) buttonholed me about main entry being obsolete!

Ian Fairclough

Marion (Ohio) Public Library

Tim Knight, 12/05/2005, 22:18

[FRBR] Re: Cataloguing of Collections

I wonder about allowing the main entry to disappear. If the main entry is no longer used materials by a particular author will no longer be collocated on the shelf or in a class search in a given subject area.

Without a designated main entry an author's works will be scattered throughout the subject area. Will this be the function of the 'primary access point'? And if so, how is this different from the notion of a main entry?

Thanks.

F. Tim Knight, Cataloguing Team Leader

Great Library, The Law Society of Upper Canada

Misha Schutt, 12/05/2005, 23:44

[FRBR] Re: Collections 1

Since the 505 is a transcribed field, I would venture to say that the corresponding 7XX added entries are no more redundant than the 240 of a monographic work would be-- they are the authorized versions of the titles transcribed in the 505. (Since I've been recently adding 505s to collections of plays in our library, I'm becoming aware just how variable the transcribed titles can be.)

Misha Schutt

Catalog Librarian

Burbank (Calif.) Public Library

Miriam Nauri, 13/05/2005, 09:27

[FRBR] Re: Collections 1

This is indeed a good point. However, if we look at cataloguing rules as rules governing the relevance of recording information one can question whether it is the information in 505 (titles as written on the manifestation) or in the 7XX (authorized title, i.e. work-title) that should be given privilege.

I believe that the case of 245 vs. 240 is a bit different from the case of 505 vs. 7XX. In the first case the title recorded in 245 is given a prominent place on the manifestation and can indeed be called a citation title for the manifestation. Users often come to know a "book" by the most prominent title on the title page, therefore this is vital information to record in a bibliographic record! I do not believe that it is the same case with various forms of titles that are transcribed in 505.

Miriam

Miriam Nauri, 13/05/2005, 09:32

[FRBR] Re: Cataloguing of Collections

Martin,

FRBR Listserv Archive

I believe that you are right. Cataloguing rules indeed deal with relevance. They state a minimum information that has to be recorded in the records, but more information can always be added. Thank you for reminding us of that.

Miriam

Miriam Nauri, 13/05/2005, 09:46
[FRBR] Re: Cataloguing of Collections

It is very interesting to learn about current thinking around the issue of main entry. Thank you for providing that information. The movement away from "main entry" is welcomed, I believe. However, the term "primary access point" seems to be very similar to the one of main entry. Personally, I think that it would be better to use a term that stresses that this is information that provides the identification of the work, expression, manifestation or item described in the records.

Miriam

Barbara Tillett, 13/05/2005, 14:52
[FRBR] Re: Cataloguing of Collections

The collocation on the shelf and in displays will still be there by the name of the creator of the work (when that is appropriate) - as you know, some displays and arrangements aren't by main entry now. We aren't changing that - just the naming of the concepts to move away from card based, linear file display format thinking. "Access points" and the use of a "primary access point" still accomplishes the same goal as we had with a main entry heading (not just 'main entry,' which also was the full descriptive record in the book and card catalog days or the full MARC bibliographic record). The 'main entry' terminology has always caused problems (you've heard the joke about patrons thinking it's the front door to the library), and we are hoping to be more clear in the future. - Barbara

Jane W. Jacobs, 13/05/2005, 16:42
[FRBR] Chapter Title Rant

Although the rest of the points in your post are well taken, I must, respectfully take issue with one of your conclusions:

>Another implication of their findings, though they don't make it, is that >the catalog needs better keyword access that today's traditional >descriptions provide, for example, more routine inclusion of table of >contents information.

We may need better keyword access, but I don't think keyword indexing of chapter titles is going to give it to us. My experience has been that willy-nilly keyword indexing as many fields as possible, particularly contents, is the bane keyword indexing. If you include chapter titles (which in some records I've seen go on for screens and screens) your hit lists pretty quickly get so big that everything is meaningless. Sometimes ordinary words like "trees" become stopwords and response times slow to a crawl. Furthermore it's worth noting that Amazon (probably our customers' most familiar model) doesn't index them, or, as far as I can see, even bother to include them for books. For music it seems they do, and this, of course, is a somewhat different case.

I'm not arguing against including chapter titles in the record, but the idea of routinely keyword indexing them doesn't really make sense. Again with a caveat for sound recordings, I wonder though if you could track hits to a separate screen with chapter titles whether you find that many customers really go there. I, personally, would WAY rather have the index or even the jacket blurb. I tend to think that the chapter title "vogue" is more a function of publisher/distributor convenience in supplying this than anything the customer wants.

Hopefully this is where the granularity of FRBR kicks in. You could Contents type items at a lower level than some of the other more crucial information.

Just my opinion, of course!

Jane Jacobs

FRBR Listserv Archive

Asst. Coord., Catalog Division
Queens Borough Public Library
Jamaica, NY 11432

Misha Schutt, 17/05/2005, 19:37

Re: [FRBR] Collections 1: 505 vs. 7XX contents

In the interests of economy of record size, then, giving 7XX entries *instead of* a 505 for collections/anthologies would require us to drop the old AACR concept/expectation (21.29F) that each "access point" entry (except for subject headings, which have in the past been used as a kind of inadequate substitute for content descriptors) must/should be justified by something in the transcription/description.

The rule states that "if the reason for an added entry is not apparent from the description ..., provide a note" making explicit the relationship of the added entry to the work. I don't think it's objectionable to discard or soften such a rule, especially if there's some indicator or fixed-field tag to indicate that the collection is being analyzed by way of 7XX entries instead of a transcribed 505.

The next can of worms here, though, and probably the most demanding for classical music recordings, will probably be the issue of how much information to provide for specific expressions, e.g. in a compilation disc containing a selection of previously issued performances--will there be a way to relate these 7XX's to their previous manifestations? That would either require 7XX entries (and presumably also authority records) to contain expression-specific details, or leave such information in 508/511/518 notes. Will there be authority records for much-anthologized "legendary" performances, with some kind of 7XX subfield relator to connect with them?

I think we need to take a very object-oriented approach to these issues--an expression as a daughter-object of a work, and a manifestation as a package containing one or more expressions, being sure to associate the attributes of each with the level to which they belong: a work will have a form, a genre, an aesthetic (e.g. Baroque, Romantic), a (rough) date of conception/creation, a history related to the composer's life (revisions, perhaps loss and rediscovery of manuscript) ; a printed expression (score) will have editor, date of first issue, plate numbers; a recorded expression will have performers, location, running time, recording media; a manifestation will have a physical format, publisher number, packaging, liner notes.

(Pardon me for bringing in thorny issues, but I started thinking about these things thirty years ago when, coming from student days in a music library with high hopes for what computers could do for cataloging, I was crushed to see that MARC records were basically glorified catalog cards. I am extremely excited to see this long-overdue multilayered approach to cataloging and authority work come into fruition.)

Misha Schutt

Catalog Librarian

Burbank (Calif.) Public Library

Patrick Le Boeuf, 18/05/2005, 10:39

Re: [FRBR] Collections 1: 505 vs. 7XX contents

I warmly support Misha Schutt's plea for authority records for recorded performances. This is precisely the reason why I fell in love with the FRBR model a few years ago, when I still was a cataloguer for sound recordings; even before I was aware of the existence of FRBR, I was getting tired of entering the same data over and over again every time the same jam session happened to be embodied in a new release (jazz cataloging is a nightmare, even more so than 'legendary' performances of classical music!)-sometimes

accurate and detailed data when the liner notes were carefully edited, sometimes inaccurate and incomplete data when the liner notes were not so carefully edited (o sacrosanct principle of transcription!), although the recording content was basically the same (at that time, we used to make analytical entries for each single work/expression contained in a CD at the National Library of France; now my colleagues have stopped doing so because it was eventually deemed too time-consuming, and as a consequence the bibliographic records for sound recordings currently created by BnF

FRBR Listserv Archive

are totally useless, as they don't even include a content note). I often pondered: "Would it not be more rational and helpful to describe that recording session once and for all, and to make a link to the most accurate description every time the content of the recording session is published once again?" And then FRBR came-yes, at last we had a conceptual tool that made it possible to have that more rational approach! In 2000, I did hope FRBR would be an opportunity for designing radically new cataloguing rules that would include the creation of authority records for recorded performances. Now I think I was too naive. Cataloguing rules may change in the future, but presumably not to that point-it would be deemed both too time-consuming and too costly. We'll always have to rely on private initiatives such as the Gramophone and Diapason classical guides for the precise identification of musical Expressions. The Gramophone classical guide is more FRBR-compliant than our music catalogues will ever be. If private companies do our job better than we do, what future can we hope for libraries? Have we ever assessed the actual utility of such headings as "Piano music. Selections"? How often does a user search a determined Manifestation, and how often does a user search a determined Expression? Is it the same proportion in the case of sound recordings as in the case of printed textual materials?

I often think of libraries as a kind of Fafner sleeping on a treasure, both unable to exploit it himself and unwilling to allow others to exploit it. But maybe I'm too much pessimistic.

Patrick

Sherman Clarke, 26/05/2005, 15:19

Re: [FRBR] access & description & redundancy

The message below from Renette Davis (University of Chicago) appeared on a list concerning integrating resources. It is her report on a discussion of access-level records at the Library of Congress, and addresses the issues of access and description, and redundancy, which were discussed here on the FRBR list recently. Access is really what FRBR is aimed at. The outline of Renette's presentation is available at <http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/staffweb/depts/cat/serials/access.html>
Sherman Clarke, NYU Libraries - sherman.clarke@nyu.edu

As I mentioned yesterday, I gave a report to our Cataloging Forum on LC's access level record, and it was followed by a good discussion. I thought I would share some of the comments with this group in case any of you are also discussing the possibility of creating access level records at your institution. I would be interested in hearing any comments that are being made by staff at your institutions as well.

There was general agreement that an 042 authentication code should be developed for access level records. People did not think that a 3 in the Encoding level was enough to identify these records.

There was some thought that a 650 with second indicator 4 would be better than 653 for subjects when there is doubt about whether a new subject heading is justified. In our local catalog, 653 is not indexed in the subject alphabetical browse index, but a 650 with second indicator 4 would be. Also, catalogers felt that the structure of a 653 is much more free and they see all kinds of terms there, where a 650 would more likely be constructed following subject cataloging conventions.

There was some discussion about eliminating redundancy in access level records. It was felt that it's a good thing to eliminate redundancy when the same information occurs two places that a user can see in the record, such as eliminating the statement of responsibility because the information is in an added entry. However, it was felt that redundancy between something which the user can see in the record and something which is coded in a fixed field is different. If place of publication, for example, is only coded in the 008, and then place is used as a search limit, the user may not realize why he got this particular record because the place of publication is not in the record where it can be seen by the user. The same could be said for date.

There was a lot of concern about duplicate records in OCLC if someone has already cataloged the resource and then LC creates an access level record for it. We do not think it would be cheaper for us to create an access level record here rather than use a record that someone else has created, so we have some difficulty understanding LC's

FRBR Listserv Archive

reason for not searching for copy and using it if found. We assume that the difference is that we generally use copy as is, as long as it is basically "ok" as far as providing access to the resource, rather than upgrading it to a "perfect" record. In general our catalogers like the idea of the access level record, and we are planning to pursue the possibility of our creating them here. I will be giving a report at next month's Committee on Reference meeting, similar to the one I gave at the Cataloging Forum meeting yesterday. It will be informational only, since we haven't actually made any decisions yet about how we will use access level records or if we will create them ourselves.
Renette

Roberto Sturman, 15/06/2005, 09:56

Re: [FRBR] Some doubts about the FRBR F.R. (1997), par 5.7

I have some doubts about the "Alternate format/Simultaneously released edition" relationship (FRBR Final Report, 1997, par. 5.7, PP. 76-77). The FRBR F.R. states: "[...] The alternate relationship obtains, for example, when a publication is released simultaneously by different publishers in different countries [...]".

The point is that in such cases it makes no sense to use the relationship specification "has an alternate" AND "is an alternate", since the use of this pair implies the existence of an original, first edition, which does not occur.

In my opinion the use of the pair should be therefore avoided and only one of these specification used.

The question I have submitted emerges during the FRBR database design, where all unnecessary relationship specifications have to be avoided.

Roberto Sturman

Universita' degli Studi di Trieste - Dipartimento di Fisica - BIBLIOTECA

Glenn Patton, 17/06/2005, 16:30

Re: [FRBR] FW: FRBR Paper Available for MARBI Discussion

The paper described below will be of interest to this list.

Glenn Patton

OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

-----Original Message-----

From: MARC [mailto:MARC@loc.gov] On Behalf Of Jacqueline Radebaugh

Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2005 11:37 AM

To: MARC@sun8.LOC.GOV

Subject: FRBR Paper Available for MARBI Discussion

Dear All

The report, "Using MARC 21 with FRBR: Record Configurations" is available online at: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-report02.pdf>. It will be discussed during the June 26th MARBI meeting (see: http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/an2005_age.html for the updated MARBI agenda).

Best wishes,

Jackie Radebaugh

Library of Congress

Network Development & MARC Standards Office Washington, DC USA

Miriam Nauri, 20/06/2005, 15:58

Re: [FRBR] FW: FRBR Paper Available for MARBI Discussion

Thank you for supplying the discussion list with Sally McCallum's paper. It is indeed of great interest!

One comment that might just concern the graphic representation of models A and B:

It looks as if Person/Corporate names come in two different types. One is the type of person/corporate name that represents a creator and the other one is a person/corporate name that is an editor, publisher etc - i.e. is responsible for a

FRBR Listserv Archive

manifestation. However, the same person can be both creator of works and responsible for manifestations. It seems illogical to treat the same physical person as belonging to two different types, but rather it is the same person having two different types of relationships. It might not at all be the purpose of McCallum and Tillett to present persons/corporate names as belonging to two different types but this should be clarified in the graphic presentation of the models.

Miriam Nauri

John Attig, 20/06/2005, 16:46

Re: [FRBR] FW: FRBR Paper Available for MARBI Discussion

I believe that this distinction is implied in the FRBR model. It will certainly be implied in the combined FRBR/FRAR model that we eagerly anticipate.

There are two types of relationships involved here:

1. The relationships between the manifestation and the Group 2 entities that are responsible for various aspects of the content or production.
2. The relationships between the manifestation and the Group 1 entities that are either realized in the manifestation or are related to it in some way.

The name of a person (and occasionally the name of a corporate body) is an important component of the access point or citation of a work or expression. That name would be included in the authorized heading or in variant headings in the authority record for the work or expression. In this case, it is the access point for the work or expression that is related to the manifestation, not the name as an independent entity.

John Attig
Penn State University

Patrick Le Boeuf, 22/06/2005, 11:22

Re: [FRBR] Report on the Dublin Workshop

Dear all,

A report on the Dublin Workshop dedicated to FRBR implementation issues that took place on May 2-4 is now available from <http://www.oclc.org/research/events/frbr-workshop/report.htm>. Many thanks to OCLC and more particularly Glenn Patton and Ed O'Neill for posting it on the Web!

With best wishes,
Patrick

William Denton, 27/06/2005, 04:31

Re: [FRBR] New Blog on FRBR

Hello,

I was able to go to the May FRBR workshop hosted by IFLA and OCLC, and it was very interesting and thought-provoking. I'm really glad I was there. One of the things that struck me was that many smart people are working on FRBR but it's hard for the average person to follow it all. It's especially hard for people out of the loop of academic journals and association memberships. There's this mailing list, of course, but I got to thinking that a FRBR weblog would be useful.

So I started one. I've set up

<http://www.frbr.org/>

and filled it with some things I'd had bookmarked. Please have a look and tell me any suggestions or comments you have, especially including good things to link to. If you have something FRBRish on the web, or a paper in a journal somewhere, I'd love to hear about it.

I hope that over the next few months I'll have lots of interesting links to post, and that the blog becomes a useful resource for people--not just librarians, but anyone interested in FRBR--wanting to stay up to date.

RSS feeds are available, and comments are allowed on all the entries.

Cheers,

Bill

FRBR Listserv Archive

Barbara B. Tillett, 29/06/2005, 15:39

Re: [FRBR] New Blog on FRBR

Bill - Patrick LeBoeuf has maintained the "FRBR Bibliography": <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/bibliography.htm> on the Web to list publications, and presentations, training materials, etc. (hot links to full text and Powerpoints, etc.), so you might want to make that link more prominently on your blog (gives an alternate way to present similar information!). - Barbara

William Denton, 29/06/2005, 16:12

Re: [FRBR] New Blog on FRBR

Thanks for mentioning that. I hadn't looked at it recently and didn't know it was so complete. I'll make it one of the permanent and obvious links.
Bill

Patrick Le Boeuf, 29/06/2005, 17:13

Re: [FRBR] New Blog on FRBR

Dear Barbara and William (and everyone else on the listserv), The FRBR bibliography that is available as PDF file on IFLANET at the URL indicated by Barbara is not constantly updated; the RTF version that is available at http://infoserv.inist.fr/wwsympa.fcgi/d_read/frbr/FRBR_bibliography.rtf is a really current bibliography and would be perhaps more relevant as a permanent link. It is stored on the FRBR discussion list's Web site but I made that it be available for anyone, even without subscribing to the list. Please notify me if you hear about people outside the list complaining that they cannot open the file.
Best wishes,
Patrick

Martha M. Yee, 21/07/2005, 16:12

Re: [FRBR] New article published in Postprints

Just wanted to let everyone know that my article published recently in Information Technology and Libraries and entitled "FRBRization: a Method for Turning Online Public Finding Lists into Online Public Catalogs" has been published in the eScholarship Repository Postprints series.

You can access it by going to this URL:

<http://repositories.cdlib.org/postprints/715>

I'd love to hear what people on the list think of it...

Martha

Jennifer Bowen, 27/07/2005, 21:46

Re: [FRBR] new FRBR article available online

Colleagues:

I am happy to report that ALA Publishing has given me permission to post my article, "FRBR: Coming Soon to Your Library?" through the University of Rochester's digital repository, UR Research. The article was published earlier this month in Library Resources and Technical Services 49 no. 3 (July 2005): 175-188.

The article is now available online at <http://hdl.handle.net/1802/1770>

A few comments about the article: it is based on a presentation that I gave at the ALCTS FRBR Preconference in Orlando, Florida, in June 2004. For that event, I was asked to speak about my work with the Joint Steering Committee's Format Variation Working Group as well as about efforts that we have made at the University of Rochester to incorporate FRBR into some of our web products. The article may seem to jump around a bit from topic to topic, but my underlying goal was to try to make FRBR

FRBR Listserv Archive

seem more accessible to people, so that they could start to visualize how FRBR might start to affect their own libraries.

I would be pleased to hear your comments on the article.

Jennifer Bowen

University of Rochester

(and ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR)

Glenn Patton, 29/07/2005, 20:22

Re: [FRBR] Worldwide review of Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR)

The IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records is pleased to announce that a draft of "Functional Requirements for Authority Records" is now available for worldwide review. The draft in English and French is on the IFLA web site at <http://www.ifla.org/VII/d4/wg-franar.htm>. Comments should be sent by October 28, 2005 to:

Glenn Patton

OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

Kristin Antelman, 30/07/2005, 00:00

Re: [FRBR] thoughts related to Yee and Bowen articles

I was excited to see two excellent articles about FRBR (by Martha Yee and Jennifer Bowen) appear in the same month. They each raise important implementation challenges--both from the perspective of the cataloger and the future catalog designer. I'd like to comment on the need for better work and expression level access in the catalog, which both articles address. (forgive the naivete shown here-- I am not a cataloger)

It was sobering to be reminded, as Martha did, that the root of much of our work/expression access problem in our current catalogs is not the absence of FRBR--in any sense--but our catalogs' poor implementation of Lubetzky's principles, perfectly exemplified, as she notes, by the lack of true author/title searching (much requested by catalog users ever since catalogs went online).

My general concern with beefing up the work/expression by creating additional or more consistently-applied "identifiers" (we need to be careful in characterizing un-normalized alpha-numeric strings as identifiers when talking with developers) is that by doing that we make the FRBR system developer's task not a lot easier. It is inevitable that there will be training challenges and implementation inconsistencies in creating the alphanumeric identifiers (as we see now with uniform title), and the catalog will fail to match text strings where matches should have occurred. I agree with Martha and Jennifer on the importance of identifiers, whether they be uniform titles or other work- or expression-level identifiers. For the kind of displays and innovative applications that build on catalog data, or link out from catalogs, that we imagine FRBR facilitating, a catalog requires an identifier that is explicit, i.e., an opaque numeric identifier consistently assigned to the abstract entities. Systems, rather than catalogers, could assign these.

Martha points out that any given element of the description may at times identify different entities, and that sometimes one must look at a collection of manifestations to determine the expression title (are they all the same), etc. This kind of thing is difficult and expensive for system designers to code; hence, the numerous shortcuts that are now reflected in our catalogs. Assigning an opaque identifier to the work or expression entity would be a step toward thinking about our need to increase the explicitness, really the semantic value, of our bibliographic records.

I also wanted to comment that there might be alternative ways to achieve the objectives outlined by Jennifer in discussing expression-level headings. Perhaps through some combination of system design and cataloging rules there could be a mechanism for a cataloger to indicate when a given data element in the bib or authority record was to be "flagged" to identify an expression (for instance language, edition, medium). That would address the precoordination problem as well as support flexibility in defining which attributes identify a new expression (as seemed to be the desire of many who attended the May FRBR symposium at OCLC).

-Kristin

Kristin Antelman

FRBR Listserv Archive

Associate Director for Information Technology
NCSU Libraries

William Denton, 02/08/2005, 15:42
Re: [FRBR] FRBR in RDF

Ian Davis and Richard Newman have designed a way of expressing FRBR relations in RDF, and made it public late last week:

<http://vocab.org/frbr/core#>

<http://vocab.org/frbr/extended#>

Ian Davis talks about it some more on his blog:

<http://internetalchemy.org/2005/07/frbr-and-rdf>

Bill

William Denton : Toronto, Canada : www.miskatonic.org : www.frbr.org

William Denton, 05/08/2005, 05:02
Re: [FRBR] Bibliotheca Universalis

I just found out about the Bibliotheca Universalis conference going on next week before the IFLA conference (if it was mentioned here before, I forgot):

<http://www.fl.a.fi/frbr05/>

The program shows some really interesting talks and presentations. Some people on the list will be there and I hope they'll let the rest of us know what it was like!

Does anyone know if the papers/slides will be posted online afterwards? Along with everything else, the last talk, about Conrad Gessner, looks especially good. I've never heard of him before.

Cheers,

Bill

William Denton : Toronto, Canada : www.miskatonic.org : www.frbr.org

William Denton, 23/08/2005, 05:58
Re: [FRBR] What happened at the IFLA Conference?

Hello,

Is there any news from the Review Group's meeting at the IFLA conference? I imagine it'll be a little while before the minutes are posted and those of us who weren't there would be interested in hearing about anything exciting.

Cheers,

Bill

William Denton : Toronto, Canada : www.miskatonic.org : www.frbr.org

Martha Yee, 29/08/2005, 17:10
Re: [FRBR] Worldwide review of Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR)

Comments on Functional Requirements for Authority Records, draft 2005-06-15 for worldwide review

Martha M. Yee

Cataloging Supervisor, UCLA Film and Television Archive

General comments:

I have the same concern about FRAR that I have about FRBR: By separating the author entity from the work entity in these models, we could easily lose the ability to identify a work using both its author and title in conjunction. Author and title are not simply a relationship. For hundreds of years of Anglo-American practice, author and title in conjunction have made up the identifier of a work of single personal authorship. The author alone cannot identify the work. The title alone cannot identify the work. The work identifier must contain both to have a reasonable chance of being both unique and recognizable to the majority of catalog users wherever it

FRBR Listserv Archive

appears, whether under a subject heading, or in response to a keyword search that has retrieved a thousand records or more.

Places in FRAR where damage to the concept of a unique and recognizable work identifier appears to be taking place already:

p. 14, under Name: "Includes titles by which works, expressions, manifestations and items are known." A work of single personal authorship is known by both its author and its title. It is Beethoven's 5th, not 5th.

p. 46, 6.4.4, Relationships between Works and Names: The only example given here is of a work that is currently identified in the LC/NACO authority file using a corporate body and a title (Orthodox Eastern Church. Pentekostarion) and yet here in this example, only the title is given to identify the work (Pentekostarion).

p. 49, Table 3, Mapping of Attributes and Relationships to User Tasks, Work: The author of the work is crucial to its identification and yet is not listed here as an attribute that is available to enable either finding or identification.

Even more generally, FRAR does not address the need to have a preferred form of name for a given entity as soon as that entity must be displayed in a list of other entities. Certainly, we need to develop more flexibility in allowing different users to have different preferred forms for the same entity depending on the users' age, language and script preferences, cultural background, etc. However, for any given user, a preferred form must be designated, and it must display whenever that entity appears in a list in response to a search. If the same entity is identified under more than one form of name in a list that includes other different entities, the user will be presented with an unforgivably confusing situation.

p. 23, 5.6, Attributes of a Manifestation, Edition/issue designation:

This paragraph uses the term manifestation for what is defined in FRBR as an expression. To quote from FRBR itself, "Strictly speaking, any change in intellectual or artistic content constitutes a change in expression. Thus, if a text is revised or modified, the resulting expression is considered to be a new expression, no matter how minor the modification may be." Clearly, a second edition would be a new expression not the new manifestation this passage in FRAR implies.

p. 28, Title:

This section should also take into account the necessity in computer catalogs of providing access under title variants such as variant spellings of common words (colour/color), spelled-out numerals (2/II/two) and the like.

p. 29, 5.14, Attributes of an Access Point:

Other important attributes of access points include:

- whether or not the access point is being used as a subject heading (personal name, corporate name or work as subject)
- whether or not the access point for a personal name or corporate name is for a person or body responsible for the content of the work, expression or manifestation to which it is attached
- whether or not the access point for a personal name or corporate name is for a person or body addressed in correspondence, serving as defendant in a trial reported in the work, collector of the material that makes up the work (i.e., provenance), etc. (cf. the third paragraph of 6.2 on p. 34)
- whether or not an access point for a work is for the work as a related work
- whether or not an access point for a work is for the work as a work contained within another work (as a component work).

p. 43, 6.4.1, Relationships between Persons and Names, Pseudonym relationship:

This needs a lot of work to make finer distinctions among, for example, a pseudonym that makes up one of several bibliographic identities, a pseudonym that has been used consistently instead of the author's real name (and is thus the only identifier for that author), and other assumed names that are *not* pseudonyms (pseudonyms apply only to those who write), for example, stage names, which, again, are the only identifier for the actors and actresses that use them.

Martha M. Yee

Cataloging Supervisor

UCLA Film and Television Archive

1015 N. Cahuenga Blvd.

Los Angeles, CA 90038-2635

Bruce D'Arcus, 29/08/2005, 22:58

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: [FRBR] analyticals, serials

Hi,

Am new to the list, and am hoping for some help on the following problem:

I am not a library person, but rather a scholar, and am working a bit with the new FRBR RDF schema to see if it can do a better job modeling my metadata than my current MODS/XML workflow.

For the most part, I'm fairly clear how to handle given records, but where I get utterly confused is with analyticals, and particularly those published as parts of serials. In short: articles.

Here's where I'm at now, using the RDF notation 3 syntax:

```
<http://purl.org/net/darcusb/references#darcusb-boundaries>
a frbr:Work, frbr:Scholarly ;
frbr:title "Some Article"@en ;
frbr:realization [
a frbr:Text ;
frbr:embodiment <http://example.net/refs#doe-2004>
] .
```

```
<http://purl.org/net/darcusb/references#doe-2004>
a frbr:Article ;
rbib:pages "11-34" ;
rbib:volume "4" ;
rbib:issue "1" ;
frbr:partOf <urn:issn:3425-7564> .
```

```
<http://purl.org/net/darcusb/periodicals#space-polity>
a frbr:Work, frbr:Scholarly ;
frbr:title "Space and Polity"@en ;
frbr:realization [
a frbr:Text ;
frbr:embodiment <urn:issn:3425-7564>
] .
```

```
<urn:issn:3425-7564>
a frbr:Periodical, frbr:Journal .
```

In English, what I'm doing is using the issn to identify the manifestation, which I'm assigning types of Periodical and Journal (the "a ..." language is assigning types -- analogous to frbr "form" -- to the resources).

So, problem 1: I've since realized that issns are really bad ways to map data to the frbr. It seems in some cases they refer to the manifestation (because there are different issns for print and electronic versions, for example), while in other cases either the expression or even the work (because the same issn is used for different versions/formats).

So what to do about this?

The second complication is exactly where and how to do the linking. In this case, I'm linking the article -- understood as a manifestation -- to the periodical manifestation. For some reason it feels wrong to me to link at the work level, since a work published as an article may later be published as part of an edited collection (or maybe that's no problem afterall?). Similarly, it seems to me that sometimes newspaper articles may be available in one edition, and not another.

The other issue is that locators like page numbers are critical for citations (I'm a scholar, so that's my interest), but those locators are only valid for a given expression, or perhaps even manifestation.

Finally, I'm unsure about at what level one assigns the types (what is called "form" in the frbr report) here. Do I have it right that an article or periodical would be manifestation level types? Or might they be appropriate at the work level?

Any thoughts, observations, etc. would be much appreciated.

Bruce

Bruce D'Arcus, 08/09/2005, 15:09

FRBR Listserv Archive

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

Re: the message I posted a week or two ago on analyticals, I never got a response but ended up working on it a bit some more. So I decided to just create diagrams that modelled the representation of an article later republished as part of a book, in both the frbr and prism/dc.

<http://www.users.muohio.edu/darcusb/images/FRBR-1.pdf>

My tentative conclusion is that -- with respect to parts/analyticals.-- a hierarchical frbr model would require linking at all levels of the model, which suggests to me that it is too complex a model to implement in my realm (citations for scholars/students).*

Standalone objects are of course much easier to manage.

I'm the co-project lead for the OpenOffice bibliographic project., and interested in promoting standard data models and exchange formats for these sorts of tools. Seems to me that for tools that need extensive support for parts modelling, an frbr-inspired approach might be appropriate for internal models, but not as a general exchange approach.

Thoughts?

Bruce

Miriam Nauri, 08/09/2005, 16:04

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

Bruce,

If I understand you correctly, you suggest that the article should only be linked at the manifestation level with the book and the journal. I agree. Indeed, I think there is support for such a view in the FRBR-model itself. (although I am aware that there are other opinions) I do not see why there must be links at the expression and work levels, since the properties of the work and expression of the article are inherited in the manifestation.

I am also inclined to question the work-status of the book and the journal. These are not works in the same way that the article is and are not "distinct intellectual or artistic creation[s]". There is a contradiction in the FRBR-model concerning aggregates, I believe. On the one hand they cannot be works according to the definition above. On the other hand, every manifestation must manifest a (=1) work in the FRBR-model.

Miriam Nauri

Bruce D'Arcus, 08/09/2005, 16:37

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

On 9/8/05, Miriam Nauri wrote:

> If I understand you correctly, you suggest that the article should only be
> linked at the manifestation level with the book and the journal. I agree.
> Indeed, I think there is support for such a view in the FRBR-model itself.
> (although I am aware that there are other opinions) I do not see why there
> must be links at the expression and work levels, since the properties of the
> work and expression of the article are inherited in the manifestation.
This is what I had originally thought, and am still open to that possibility. I had, however, gotten round to the notion that the linking must happen at all levels.
Any other thoughts?

> I am also inclined to question the work-status of the book and the journal.
> These are not works in the same way that the article is and are not
> "distinct intellectual or artistic creation[s]". There is a contradiction in
> the FRBR-model concerning aggregates, I believe. On the one hand they cannot
> be works according to the definition above. On the other hand, every
> manifestation must manifest a (=1) work in the FRBR-model.

You mean an *edited* book is not a work? Or a "book" is not a work?

As for journals, I suppose you mean because it's just a collection of volumes and issues and articles, and that it per se has no authorship? It's not a distinct intellectual creation.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Yes, that may be an issue (except the people that found a journal may think differently), though there is the practical issue that, in addition to the one you note, it might be valuable for a system to assume journals and such are work-like for the purposes of query and such?

Bruce

Antony Gordon, 08/09/2005, 16:38

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

I agree with Miriam. The work (i.e. the article itself) has two expressions, first in a periodical that has a published manifestation and later in a book that also has a published manifestation.

I feel uncomfortable with the idea of a loose collection being defined as a work (and the mere word analyticals immediately implies that they are) -- but maybe that's because I'm coming from a music and sound recordings background. Whilst it's true that an editor or compiler has expended intellectual effort in bringing the collection together I wonder if that's stretching the model to the extent that it hinders rather than helping.

Antony Gordon

Miriam Nauri, 08/09/2005, 17:17

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

Bruce,

In the case of the edited book one could indeed argue that it should have a work-status. The problem is that if one were to subtract the intellectual contents contributed by the included works, in many cases there would be little content left for the *work* of the editor. I understand that it would not be practical for cataloguers to have to judge for each case if the editors contribution is considerable enough to get a work-status.

Thus it might be more practical to give all editors work-status. In cataloguing practise, though, I think it should be made clear what goes together with what. This is not the case today, at least not with current cataloguing rules and MARC21. A collection of Shakespeare, for example, receives its name-title authority from the authorised form for Shakespeare + the name of the collection. If one is to create a bibliography of the works of Shakespeare out of a library catalogue one would necessarily end up with the impression that Shakespeare wrote a lot more than I actually did, including "The complete dramatic and poetic works of William Shakespeare" published in 1910. However this work(?) should have the relation "created by" to its editor, William Allan Neilson, not to Shakespeare. Shakespeare has no relation to the collection, but to the included works. I hope that this will be made clear in future cataloguing rules.

Miriam

Terry Willan, 08/09/2005, 19:10

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

I think Miriam makes a good point with her example of the shakespeare collection.

To get back to Bruce's article, it seems to me that the only way to avoid contradiction in the model is to require a relationship at only one level. I also believe that we have to avoid endless philosophical debates about what is a work and be pragmatic: anything that we want to deal with as a manifestation, like the book containing Bruce's article/chapter, must be a manifestation of a work. There can be works within works, and expressions within expressions.

So I would suggest that the relationship is either at the Work or Expression level: the expression of this article/chapter thing is part of the expression of that bookWork and part of the expression of that serialWork. I suggest the link at the expression level here because I think the relationship should be made at the lowest meaningful level, since it incorporates the higher level(s).

Terry Willan

FRBR Listserv Archive

Barbara B. Tillett, 08/09/2005, 21:56

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

It will depend on what kind of links you want to make for relationships - most "content relationships" are at the work and expression levels (equivalent content, derivative content, descriptive content, and whole/part for logical content parts, as well as the successive and accompany relationships), but there also can be whole-part relationships for the pieces (physical parts) of manifestation/item levels as well. Just as a reminder a "book" can be many things depending on the context of using the word, but often we think of it as a particular copy (item) that is an example of the manifestation that contains an expression of a work - and it can be more complex, containing multiple works that we may or may not wish to bring out in the cataloging record. - Barbara Tillett

Bruce D'Arcus, 09/09/2005, 03:49

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

On 9/8/05, Terry Willan <Terry.Willan@talisis.com> wrote:

> So I would suggest that the relationship is either at the Work or
> Expression level: the expression of this article/chapter thing is part
> of the expression of that bookWork and part of the expression of that
> serialWork. I suggest the link at the expression level here because I
> think the relationship should be made at the lowest meaningful level,
> since it incorporates the higher level(s).

For that to work for citation purposes, it would probably assume that page numbers are stable within expressions. Is that the case?

So for sake of argument, you have the exact same text that is published as a 300 page printed book, and also a 350 page eBook. Are they the same expression, or different?

The reason it matters for citations is that if I have a reference like (Doe, 1999, p23) that page number better be right!

Bruce

Hal Cain, 09/09/2005, 04:41

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

Bruce D'Arcus wrote:

> So for sake of argument, you have the exact same text that is
> published as a 300 page printed book, and also a 350 page eBook. Are
> they the same expression, or different?

Same expression, different manifestation: "As an entity, manifestation represents all the physical objects that bear the same characteristics, in respect of both intellectual content and physical form."--p. 20.

> The reason it matters for citations is that if I have a reference like

> (Doe, 1999, p23) that page number better be right!

Identifying such a reference depends on a citation which gives at least the minimum information for recognition and retrieval; to be effective, where there are parallel different manifestations, the information must at least imply which one. Experience, of course, suggest authors and editors may be unaware of a different manifestation; but that's not something the FRBR model can reasonably account for! A cataloguer, though, might well note the existence of an alternative manifestation (MARC 21 530 tag exists for this purpose).

Hal Cain

Hal Cain, 09/09/2005, 04:33

Re: Works, their nature, their names, and manifestations (Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals)

Bruce D'Arcus wrote:

> You mean an *edited* book is not a work? Or a "book" is not a work?

FRBR Listserv Archive

I wonder whether it matters in practice? At a functional-definition level, something that goes under its own distinct title and isn't an expression of another work *is* to be treated as a work, surely?

I rather think that looking at these questions in two dimensions is a bit misleading; the entities and relationships in the FRBR model might be better represented in three dimensions. Here, a book which is a collection under editorial direction of pre-existent works (quite possibly distinct works, such as conference papers, which have never been catalogued separately), or a journal, are both forms of work which have a different relation to the concrete manifestation from a manifestation which is the publication of a work and expression never otherwise brought to reality.

But in terms of the links to be made in cataloguing, the treatment of a distinct work in its sole manifestation need not be different from that of the volume of collected papers, except that in some catalogues there may be more or less elaborate cataloguing of the individual papers.

> As for journals, I suppose you mean because it's just a collection of
> volumes and issues and articles, and that it per se has no authorship?
> It's not a distinct intellectual creation.

This suggests that what's at fault is not the concept of work, which may take different forms, but the terms of the specific definition. And yet a journal can be regarded as a distinct intellectual creation (of an editorial group), not of a single text but of a collection. Compare the editorial work in preparing for publication a festschrift: the intellectual effort of putting a set of disparate papers into a coherent document may be very comparable with that of writing and revising a text.

> Yes, that may be an issue (except the people that found a journal may
> think differently), though there is the practical issue that, in
> addition to the one you note, it might be valuable for a system to
> assume journals and such are work-like for the purposes of query and
> such?

Just so.

One of the outcomes of wider application of the work doctrine, whether or not elaborated so as to distinguish, in the FRBR pattern, works, expressions and manifestations, is to formulate principles, and eventually rules, for stable citation forms (i.e. names of the works). Under present practice (informed by the Paris Principles) only works which are by a single author, or by two or three authors working in concert, are entered under author's name plus title -- others are named by title (possibly with modifiers and additions to make distinctive uniform title forms). It's glaringly obvious that other inhabitants of the bibliographic universe (scholars, editors, style guide writers, etc.) have not subscribed to this doctrine of entry under title. Consistently citations are given by a name (or names in conjunction), of author, editor, compiler, plus title. Since many such citations include, or are associated with, specific references to pages or other locations within the cited document, I conclude that these citations are at the manifestation level.

That therefore invites the question: if the Paris Principles for limiting entry under author are painted, do we need other rules for names of manifestations, allowing better concordance between cataloguing and citation practices? One of the things I find myself uncomfortable with, in explaining the cataloguing practices I follow daily, is explaining why edited works are entered under title, in contradiction of the citations students and scholars bring to the catalogue, invariably under a person's name or, occasionally, a corporate name.

Hal Cain

Heuvelmann, Reinhold, 09/09/2005, 14:03

Re: [FRBR] Hofstadter's GEB: Classes and Instances

Re-Reading Douglas R. Hofstadter's "Gödel, Escher, Bach : An Eternal Golden Braid" I noticed a passage that reminded me of the FRBR group 1 entities. Hofstadter's book was first published in 1979.

"Classes and Instances

There is a general distinction concerning thinking: that between _categories_ and _individuals_, or _classes_ and _instances_. (Two other terms sometimes used are "types" and "tokens".) It might seem at first sight that a given symbol would inherently be either a symbol for a class or a symbol for an instance -- but that is

FRBR Listserv Archive

an oversimplification. Actually, most symbols may play either role, depending on the context of their activation. For example, look at the list below:

- (1) a publication
- (2) a newspaper
- (3) The San Francisco Chronicle
- (4) the May 18 edition of the Chronicle
- (5) my copy of the May 18 edition of the Chronicle
- (6) my copy of the May 18 edition of the Chronicle as it was when I first picked it up (as contrasted with my copy as it was a few days later: in my fireplace, burning)

Here, lines 2 to 5 all play both roles. Thus, line 4 is an instance of the general class of line 3, and line 5 is an instance of line 4. Line 6 is a special kind of instance of a class: a manifestation. The successive stages of an object during its life history are its manifestations. It is interesting to wonder if the cows on a farm perceive the invariant individual underneath all the manifestations of the jolly farmer who feeds them hay."

(Douglas R. Hofstadter: Gödel, Escher, Bach : An Eternal Golden Braid. Basic Books. (C) 1999, p. 351)
Reinhold Heuvelmann

Bruce D'Arcus, 09/09/2005, 19:09

Re: [FRBR] Works, their nature, their names, and manifestations (Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals)

On 9/8/05, Hal Cain <hecain@jtl.vic.edu.au> wrote:

[...snip...]

> *It's glaringly obvious that other inhabitants of the bibliographic universe (scholars, editors, style guide writers, etc.) have not subscribed to this doctrine of entry under title. Consistently citations are given by a name (or names in conjunction), of author, editor, compiler, plus title. Since many such citations include, or are associated with, specific references to pages or other locations within the cited document, I conclude that these citations are at the manifestation level.*

Citations are, I think, a mix of levels, which is partly my problem here. Standard reference lists may look something like this:

Doe, J. (1999) "Some Title", in S. Smith (Ed.) Some Book Title (New York:ABC Books), pp234-54.

The left side of the reference before the publication information is, it seems to me, work and/or expression level metadata, except for the issuance date, which is manifestation level. The rest is also manifestation level.

So if I code a citation where internally I have some xml like <citation id="doe99" page="245"/>, and that points to a work that is linked to the book at the expression level, that clearly won't work reliably, unless I also did something like <citation id="doe99" manifestation="1" page="245"/>.

> *That therefore invites the question: if the Paris Principles for limiting entry under author are paintained, do we need other rules for names of manifestations, allowing better concordance between cataloguing and citation practices? One of the things I find myself uncomfortable with, in explaining the cataloguing practices I follow daily, is explaining why edited works are entered under title, in contradiction of the citations students and scholars bring to the catalogue, invariably under a person's name or, occasionally, a corporate name.*

Indeed, any scholar who produces an edited collection would pretty much insist that they are involved in creating a work. And if I am looking for that work, I am looking for its creator (editor) too (e.g. Smith et al, 2001).

Bruce

Zoltan Tomory, 09/09/2005, 21:05

Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals

Miriam,

I think that if you change a data model, you ought to be obliged to fit all the data to that new model. I too would give a family of the new objects (work/expression/manifestation) to even those materials where the "work", regardless of how little work it took, has only one expression and one manifestation. Editors and titles of these edited things are fundamental existing access points & people will continue to use them. It does not bother me that some works exist to support a

FRBR Listserv Archive

manifestations that exist as an access points of convenience / containers for manifestations of smaller works.

I also thank Miriam's observation that these manifestations of works ought to be linked directly to each other. Much the same way that Heaney described in his Object oriented cataloging as going on between works and manifestations, pointers between these heirarchically related manifestations would borrow information directly between each other. In the case of analytics, the information that is borrowed by the contents note of that edited work is the information currently appearing in the author and title subfields of the contents note. For each smaller manifestation of a work (analytic) the information coming across that link/pointer would be the information in the citation that says where it appeared.

I thank Ed O'Neill for putting in print the idea of adding the heirarchical dimension to our records. With the use of online systems it is not as unreasonable as it may at first sound. Some day it will allow patrons to seamlessly maneuver through different bibliographical levels to accomplish tasks that currently leave them between the catalog and other tools like databases or printed indexes. Also, imagine the following OCLC search where a cataloger sitting in front of the work/expression/manifestation display hits the produce button and gets not only the w/e/m but also the w/e/m for each object referred to in the contents not and all of their authority records not currently in your system.

Now forgive me and I'd like to address an issue that has been on my mind for some time which is also related to the heirarchical relationships discussed above and would operate similarly:

Another heirarchical intrusion between bib records that we see presently is in the form of series. The lower level bib records containing a series are relating information from a higher level bib record for the series as a whole. Not infrequently, the record for the series as a whole contains a contents note listing all or some of the individual numbers within the series. When I was a young cataloger and I saw both kinds of records sitting next to each other on an OCLC menu it disturbed me a little because the classical model of the catalog says for each series "you decide to go one way or the other". Now what bothers me is that what are different sides of the same coin are separated from each other in records that do not reference each other directly, only by going out to the index and initiating "another" search.

The series statement from the manifestation of the series is actually doing work that by rights should be done by a link/pointer to the manifestation of the series level bibliographical record. The relationship from the series level bib manifestation with the individual numbers is a contents note. This part of the relationship is handled by the link/pointer as well.

In all this, what is not being used us the series authority record. The approved form of the series in the record for individual numbers within the series is coming from the series level bib. When the functionality between the bibliographic/FRBR records is adequately defined, use of series authority records can be discontinued. Apart from that, in a sweeping generalization which I think can and should be tested, the other chief features of the series authority record are: The 4xx "see references", which are chiefly alternate forms of title, or have a "corporate name. title" form that it seems like it should be able to add as an access point to the series level bib. The 5xx "see also references" refer to other forms of the series with their own series level bib records, which can best be taken care of by link/pointers attached laterally to those succeeding and preceding series in a way entirely analogous to the the way serial linking fields work (and yes serials should have link/pointers directly connecting records rather than generating entries in the index). Apart from that, notes and things can be perfectly happy in a series level bibliographic record. I think it may not be unreasonable to eliminate series authority records.

A few more words on link/pointers. The lines we draw between the boxes on our diagrams are a good deal more complicated than anyone has gone into so far. In addition to directly linking two objects, they also dictate the information that is being automatically shared by the records because the direct link exists. Of course, the link in itself is implicitly useful navigation. When I say link/pointer I mean a set of data objects, classes, that inherit from an abstract class which includes the 2 physical pointers that connect the objects virtual methods which suggest the general rules for communicating data from the tags of one record to different tags of another.

FRBR Listserv Archive

Subclasses of the abstract base class would detail the specific flow of information for a specific kind of relationship, say between 780 in one serial record and 785 in its corresponding pair. Both records are made aware of the relationship with each other and specific units of information from the other record. These link/pointers are more useful and complicated than what we call links, and are more involved than what are called pointers in the computer world.

Our work has been great with the raw data in the form of bib and now going into authority records, but there are other areas we should also concern ourselves with. This includes formal definition of the relationships between objects which I envision with link/pointer, relationships between our data objects and the indexes, issues of what to tackle with displays as opposed to data, what functionality to bundle into the system, etc. These are things we have not been done and database vendors have been abandoned to their own designs and I don't think any of them has gotten it quite right yet.

Important principles are:

- 1) Factor whatever you can out of existing records into the largest possible chunks.
 - 2) Link the chunks directly (the above being the heart of FRBR so far)
 - 3) Connect things as directly as possible whenever you can. Technology makes hotlinks possible, but you can pack much more value into the relationship.
 - 4) Make the functionality that makes all this work automatic.
 - 5) Once you have created an something, try to create as many new ways to use it as you can (e.g. Work used for bibliographic description also used to help organize displays, foster navigation between related objects, etc.)
 - 6) Leave the model open to description of all levels of bibliographic materials.
- Forever we have had paradoxes like the fact that analytics get put in according to the same rules as books or that the series level bib in my catalog worked as well as your records for individual numbers.

I regard this as foreshadowing the integration of "the catalog" into a universal bibliographical tool.

Sorry for getting carried away. I hope it makes sense. I hope this is not interpreted as a flame as it is all well meant.

Actually I have a number of other technical issues to address that I think would improve the model. Unless people object I would like to explore one or another of them from time to time.

Zoltan Tomory

Dan Matei, 09/09/2005, 22:03

Re: Works, their nature, their names, and manifestations (Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals)

Hmmm...

Why should we stick to the "Paris rule of 3" ? (In the last 10-15 years) I did not buy the main argument for it, i.e. "difuse authorship". So, if there are more than 3 authors, the authorship is "difuse". OK. What if the authors (more than 3) call themselves "Bourbaki" or "Rolling Stones", i.e. they use a sigle name ? In this case the authorship is not "difuse" ?

The real reason (IMHO) was simply the lack of space on the card. It do not aply anymore.

On the other hand, I keep arguing that there is no such thing as "several authors". If a group of people work together to create a 'work', they form a "collective mind" (?! :) (even if they "work together" asynchronously, as Shakespeare with Zefirelli to create the movie "Romeo and Juliette").

Thus, my suggestion is to have another entity (in the FRBR model), which I call "bibliographic identity" (lack of imagination, sorry). Yet another entity :-)

Coming back to the name problem: if such an identity has no shorter name than the sequence of the individual names of the 77 members of the group, bad luck ! We should carefully write all the names. In short, I would like to ban names like "Doe, Joe et al.". It's not fair to "al.", it is bad for the user and it is not "cultural".

Sorry for the diversion...

Dan

FRBR Listserv Archive

Bruce D'Arcus, 10/09/2005, 01:29

Re: Works, their nature, their names, and manifestations (Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals)

It's not that straightforward with academic authorship. Hence terms like "first author," etc. That's among the reasons there are rules in many styles that say that all author names beyond X number get truncated to et al. It's partly because often their contributions are considered lesser than those at the beginning of the list. But I agree in principle that a work can be authored by a group that is more than the sum of its parts. And the "rule of 3" you cite sounds just wrong.

Bruce

Barbara B. Tillett, 10/09/2005, 18:55

Re: Works, their nature, their names, and manifestations (Re: [FRBR] followup on analyticals)

Dan - You may be interested to know that the current IFLA work to update the basic cataloging principles (updating Paris Principles) does not have a rule of 3 (see http://www.ddb.de/news/ifla_conf_papers.htm - and there is an updated draft now being discussed that will be posted soon but does not change most of what you'll see in the earlier draft).

The use of "et al." was from ISBD, where the attempt in using Latin was to be more universally understood (supposedly by scholars and learned people), but I fear in today's world, it is universally incomprehensible to the average user. Same is true for "S.l : s.n."

Also the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR is re-examining the "rule of 3" for the new cataloging code "Resource Description and Access" (RDA). However, that rule is a practical/management solution to limiting the amount of authority work that would need to be done by a cataloger and also follows some citation practices that also limit the number of "authors" listed, so citations don't get exceedingly long. - Barbara Tillett

Dan Matei, 19/09/2005, 15:18

Re: Järvenpää, Finland ??

I would be grateful if someone would provide a "review" of the Järvenpää meeting. I'll pay in beer !

Dan

PS. Especially the debates :-)

Dan Matei, director

CIMEC - Institutul de Memorie Culturala [Institute for Cultural Memory]

Eeva Murtomaa, 20/09/2005, 8:24

Re: Järvenpää, Finland ??

Dear all:

Järvenpää seminar presentations are available on the web.

<http://www fla.fi/frbr05/prgr.htm>

Mauro Guerrini promised to provide a "review" of the meeting.

Have to inform you, when available.

We are really thankful to the speakers, the feedback has been good.

Eeva Murtomaa

Mauro Guerrini, 21/09/2005, 9:49

Re: Järvenpää, Finland ??

I will be able to send the review at the beginning of October.

Best wishes, Mauro

Hal Cain, 7/10/2005, 16:13

Re: Worldwide review of Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR)

FRBR Listserv Archive

I've seen no response to Martha Yee's comments on FRAR.

> I have the same concern about FRAR that I have about FRBR: By separating the author entity from the work entity in these models, we could easily lose the ability to identify a work using both its author and title in conjunction. Author and title are not simply a relationship. For hundreds of years of Anglo-American practice, author and title in conjunction have made up the identifier of a work of single personal authorship. The author alone cannot identify the work. The title alone cannot identify the work. The work identifier must contain both to have a reasonable chance of being both unique and recognizable to the majority of catalog users wherever it appears, whether under a subject heading, or in response to a keyword search that has retrieved a thousand records or more.

In the Anglo-American context, I can only agree. However, as an IFLA document, FRAR (and FRBR) aren't restricted to the Anglo-American patterns. Nevertheless, I'm most concerned that both documents, but *especially* FRAR, give little notice to the significance of the *names* of the bibliographic entities and their importance in making it easier for the catalogue user to find, select or reject, and obtain the best match to what they're looking for.

> Places in FRAR where damage to the concept of a unique and recognizable work identifier appears to be taking place already:

p. 14, under Name: "Includes titles by which works, expressions, manifestations and items are known." A work of single personal authorship is known by both its author and its title. It is Beethoven's 5th, not 5th.

Yes: a *name* for the work, not simply a title.

> p. 46, 6.4.4, Relationships between Works and Names: The only example given here is of a work that is currently identified in the LC/NACO authority file using a corporate body and a title (Orthodox Eastern Church. Pentekostarion) and yet here in this example, only the title is given to identify the work (Pentekostarion).

p. 49, Table 3, Mapping of Attributes and Relationships to User Tasks, Work: The author of the work is crucial to its identification and yet is not listed here as an attribute that is available to enable either finding or identification.

I agree.

> Even more generally, FRAR does not address the need to have a preferred form of name for a given entity as soon as that entity must be displayed in a list of other entities. Certainly, we need to develop more flexibility in allowing different users to have different preferred forms for the same entity depending on the users' age, language and script preferences, cultural background, etc. However, for any given user, a preferred form must be designated, and it must display whenever that entity appears in a list in response to a search. If the same entity is identified under more than one form of name in a list that includes other different entities, the user will be presented with an unforgivably confusing situation.

Exactly. And that preferred form of name should be both stable and predictable.

> p. 28, Title:

This section should also take into account the necessity in computer catalogs of providing access under title variants such as variant spellings of common words (colour/color), spelled-out numerals (2/II/two) and the like.

It is sometimes overlooked that people learn about documents not by written but by spoken communication -- formally, in lectures and addresses; informally, in conversation, heard on radio or television. The convenience of the user...

> p. 43, 6.4.1, Relationships between Persons and Names, Pseudonym relationship:

This needs a lot of work to make finer distinctions among, for example, a pseudonym that makes up one of several bibliographic identities, a pseudonym that has been used consistently instead of the author's real name (and is thus the only identifier for that author), and other assumed names that are *not* pseudonyms (pseudonyms apply only to those who write), for example, stage names, which, again, are the only identifier for the actors and actresses that use them.

There are comparable difficulties with other forms of bibliographic identity for persons; e.g. the notional person responsible for the cluster of works associated with the attributed designation "Pseudo-Augustine". Such traditionally-based attributions are unquestionably usefully expressed by such a name; yet there is no certain referent for the name, and it's at least likely that there's no one person to which that name can be related -- except, paradoxically, the one person, Augustine, whom it doesn't represent.

Finally, on the matter of the proper naming of works and of manifestations (which consist of sets of documents judged to be identical, and thus named identically) I'm at a loss to understand whose convenience is served by the application of the following clauses of the Paris Principles; not, I'm convinced the ordinary user of the catalogue, who persists (by my forty years of professional observation) overwhelmingly in citing documents by the name of a person or persons identified on the title page or other source, plus the title:

----- [excerpts]

10. Multiple authorship

FRBR Listserv Archive

When two or more authors (9) have shared in the creation of a work,

10.1 if one author is represented in the book as the principal author, the others playing a subordinate or auxiliary role, the main entry for the work should be made under the name of the principal author;

10.22 the title of the work, if the number of authors is more than three, added entries being made under the authors names first in the book and as under many other authors as may appear necessary.

10.3 Collections

The main entry for a collection consisting of independent works or parts of works by different authors should be made

10.31 under the title of the collection, if it has a collective title; [but, by contradiction--HC]

10.34 Exception: if the name of the compiler appears prominently on the title-page, the main entry may be made under the name of the compiler, with an added entry under the title.

11. Works entered under title

11.1 Works having their main entry under the title are

11.12 works by more than three authors, none of whom is principal author (see 10.22);

11.13 collections of independent works or parts of works, by different authors, published with a collective title;

I see no value in simply persisting in contradicting consistent usage.

Do we in some way know better, or have we maybe got naming of bibliographic resources wrong? Or is there a useful distinction to be drawn between patterns of naming of works (abstract content) and manifestations (documents collected, recorded, offered and managed by the library, sought and consulted by users)?

Hal Cain

Joint Theological Library
Parkville, Victoria, Australia