



Cataloguing Section

Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) Review Group

Working Group on the Expression entity: Meeting #1, Buenos Aires, 24/08/2004

Minutes

Attendees:

Cato, Anders, Royal Library, Stockholm, Sweden (chair)
Jonsson, Gunilla, Royal Library Stockholm, Sweden
Le Bœuf, Patrick, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, France
Magliano, Cristina, ICCU-SBN, Rome, Italy
Murtomaa, Eeva, Helsinki University Library
O'Neill, Ed, OCLC, Dublin, OH, USA
Patton, Glenn, OCLC, Dublin, OH, USA
Tillett, Barbara B., Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., USA

Guests:

Kuhagen, Judith, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., USA
McGarry, Dorothy, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., USA
Riesthuis, Gerhard J.A., University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Žumer, Maja, National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia

§ 1. Opening of the meeting

Anders Cato bid everyone welcome to the meeting and declared the meeting opened.

§ 2. Formalities

The documents that had been sent out were presented together with the Working Brief. It was stressed that examples from different kinds of materials were needed for the work of the working group. Three kinds of examples were above all desirable:

1. Examples of translations;
2. Examples of the same work in different formats;
3. Examples of different presentations.

§ 3. General discussion of the Expression entity

The meeting agreed upon the fact that the Expression entity needed a more detailed definition to be workable and this was also included in the group's tasks. It was however stressed that even if it should be more detailed it must stay practically applicable.

The expression entity can be defined in two ways, according to a "strict" and one more "user friendly" definition.

Following the strict definition two items compared are nearly always different, leading to the fact that almost every item is also a new expression. This is particularly valid for old material, but also to some extent for new publications.

It was pointed out that following the strict definition a line by line comparison would be almost compulsory and no cataloguer could be expected to have the time to carry that out. The user friendly definition was the one that would have to be focused on and that would also be in accordance with what was spelled out at last year's IME ICC.

According to Barbara Tillett the expression entity level was only necessary when the file being catalogued was very large. Otherwise this level could be omitted. Some questioned this way of looking upon the entity, since it would, according to them, be very difficult to reach consistency if different practices were used in different OPACs. Barbara replied that we do have standard ways of control, but we can share information in different ways. Why not make one minimal level and another "maximal"?

Patrick Le Bœuf stressed that different libraries have different needs – and different users have different needs. Should, for example, the two versions "The taming of the shrew" and "The taming of a shrew" be considered to be two different expressions with two different uniform titles or should they be put together into one work record with the same uniform title? That depends on the library – and its users.

§ 4. Specific problems

a) Hand Press Materials

Gunilla Jonsson went through the document on hand press materials that she had provided for the meeting. Using the FRBR methodology on hand press materials very often leads to serious problems. When applying the FRBR model you arrive at a solution that implies that all items belonging to a manifestation of an expression should be identical, at least if you use the expression entity in its strict sense. However, this is not the fact for hand press materials. Normally every single item differs to some extent from other items. Should one then follow the FRBR definition of expression every single item becomes a new expression. And surely this is not what we want? The old definitions according to Fredson Bowers' *Principles of bibliographical description* with the terms "work", "edition", "issue" and "state" are much more suited for older materials.

Gunilla Jonsson, however, did not want to go so far as to say that the FRBR methodology should not be applied to hand press materials, but she proposed that a wider definition of the expression entity be used, where it is not necessary to regard every small change in an item as belonging to a new expression.

b) Music Materials

Cristina Magliano handed over some examples for music materials and added some explanations. She used Gluck's *Iphigénie en Aulide* as an example of one of the problems. First there is the original work, which has its expression in the original score manifested in the edition by Bärenreiter. The opera is then performed at La Scala and that performance can be considered as an expression of the Bärenreiter manifestation and the video recording of this La Scala performance as an expression of the expression of the manifestation, this video then later being manifested in a second manifestation.

For music, it appears that it should be possible to have expressions also as sub-entities of manifestations, and of other expressions, and is this in accordance with the FRBR way of thinking? In that case the definition of the Expression entity needs to be somewhat redefined.

c) Illustrated editions.

Patrick Le Bœuf put the question whether an illustrated edition should be considered the same expression as one that is not. Or is the text one expression and the illustrations another? The "double identity" of the Expression entity should definitely be further looked into.

Gunilla Jonsson found it strange that layout is excluded from the FRBR model. Layout also conveys content.

A discussion on the layout followed in which it was stressed that layout in some cases are intended by the creator, in other cases the layout is more specifically done for the manifestation. In the web environment it is often the browser that decides the layout.

Gerhard Riesthuis wanted to go so far as to follow Patrick Le Bœuf's discussion above and look upon illustrations and text as two different expressions. Ed O'Neill then posed the question whether the illustrations were to be regarded as a single work or not. A work must be able to stand alone. Can added illustrations do that – and can notes do that? The answer must, according to Ed O'Neill be no. To regard illustrations as separate works is not practicable.

Maja Žumer added that this discussion would never reach a final solution. An illustrated book is still the same expression, but with an added extra expression to it! The same expression of a work can be published with different illustrations in different manifestations.

Barbara Tillett wanted the group to consider what elements should be included in the expression entity. According to her an illustrated book is a different expression compared to a book with the same text issued in a non illustrated edition.

Ed O'Neill concluded that either way is workable, but the worst solution is to do both methods at the same time. We do need mechanisms to tell us a) that the text is not changed; b) how to treat "dependant works".

Patrick Le Bœuf continued the discussion by stating that in science fiction literature, for example, some illustrators are considered to be so important that their illustrations are kept for other works and in some medieval literature annotations could be copied from

one book to another. Some of these problems could be solved by using different relator codes in the MARC format in XML, e.g. uniform title + illustrator, uniform title + work etc. combined with different stylesheets.

d) Collective works

Patrick Le Bœuf wanted to open a discussion on collective works and collective titles. Does a collective title imply a new work?

Maja Žumer referred to the fact that we need to make a distinction between anthologies and collective works. According to her anthologies were to be considered as new works, whereas collective works were not. An anthology is more than the sum of its parts.

A discussion then followed on the differences between anthologies and collected works. Most of the participants agreed upon the fact that there is a difference between an anthology and a collective work, but how do we clearly distinguish between them? One possibility would be to define an anthology as something as to which intellectual rights are connected, whereas no intellectual rights go with a compilation.

e) Translations

Another problem that needs to be dealt with concerns translations and this was also taken up by Patrick Le Bœuf. How should translations of versions be looked upon and also combinations of translations?

Maja Žumer stressed that the level of granularity must be flexible. Different editions can give different information about the translation history. In the MARC format it is extremely difficult to code the relationships within translations well. However, there is a clear difference between a translation of a 3rd edition and the 3rd edition of a translation.

Gunilla Jonsson noted that there is a problem with the uniform title being sometimes used to express work level and sometimes for the expression level. However different translations are different expressions, nothing else.

Barbara Tillett finally reported that within the work of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR there have been proposals to extend the uniform title to add further groupings. There will be more to say on this subject next year in Oslo.

§ 5. Examples of different types of expression entities.

As mentioned above (4 b) Cristina Magliano handed over some examples of problems with music materials. Input from other members of the working group was asked for.

§ 6. Schedule for the Working Group for 2004-2005.

In the coming year a proposal for an extended definition of the expression entity will be written together with examples from member of the group. Discussions will take place via email and maybe also during a telephone conference.

For the hand press material a comparative model needs to be made between the FRBR and the Edition-Issue-State model.

It is important that the working group stays in contact with the AACR3 group and has their minutes as soon as they are ready.

Patrick Le Bœuf is working on a challenging project on FRBR:ising Emily Dickinson, the result of which he hopes to be able to present at next year's IFLA.

Anders Cato
7 January, 2005