

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Manifestations and Near-Equivalents: Theory, with Special Attention to Moving-Image Materials

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1541x7fz>

Journal

Library Resources & Technical Services, 38

Author

Yee, Martha M

Publication Date

1994

Peer reviewed

Manifestations and Near-Equivalents: Theory, with Special Attention to Moving-Image Materials

Martha M. Yee

Differences between manifestations and near-equivalents that might be considered significant by catalog users are examined. Anglo-American cataloging practice concerning when to make a new record is examined. Definitions for manifestation, title manifestation, and near-equivalent are proposed. It is suggested that current practice leads to making too many separate records for near-equivalents. It is recommended that practice be changed so that near-equivalents are more often cataloged on the same record. Next, differences between manifestations and near-equivalents of moving-image works are examined, and their significance to users of moving-image works is assessed. It is suggested that true manifestations result when the continuity, i.e., visual aspect of the work, or the soundtrack, i.e., audio aspect of the work, or the textual aspect of the work actually differ, whether due to editing, the appending of new material, or the work of subsidiary authors creating subtitles, new music tracks, etc. Title manifestations can occur when the title or billing order differs without there being any underlying difference in continuity. Distribution information can differ without there being any underlying difference in continuity, creating a near-equivalent. Finally, physical variants or near-equivalents can occur when physical format differs without the involvement of subsidiary authors.

A manifestation of a work is a version or edition of it that differs significantly from another version or edition. A near-equivalent is used here to mean a copy of the same manifestation of a work that differs from other copies in ways that do not significantly affect the intellectual or artistic content. In this article (excerpted from Yee 1993) I will discuss the kinds of

differences that might be considered significant by catalog users, and the ways these differences have been handled by Anglo-American cataloging rules.

Two types of users will be considered: the general user, who is assumed to be interested only in significant differences in the intellectual or artistic content of a work, or in significant differences in the

citation of the work; and other users interested in more minute differences, such as the bibliographer-user, who might be interested in physical evidence of the printing and publishing history of a work, or the preservation officer, who might be interested in binding or paper of differing qualities. Indeed, a theme running through the article will be that of the differences and similarities between bibliography and cataloging.

Under current cataloging practice, the question of what is a manifestation of a work is essentially the same as the question of what is the object of a cataloging record. Note in this connection, however, that several writers (Wilson 1989, 9; Layne 1989, 192-93) have proposed work-based records; Hinnebusch (1989) has proposed devising hierarchical MARC records; Attig (1989) has discussed the difficulty of linking MARC unit records; and Yee (1991, 81) has discussed the possible value of matching keywords in user-input, known-item searches on online catalogs against the set of records that make up a work.

A good deal of what follows will concern (1) the kinds of differences between a document being cataloged (henceforward to be called an *item*) and documents that have already been cataloged and are represented by surrogate records in the database of record, which can cause the item being cataloged to be considered a new manifestation, requiring a new record, and (2) the kinds of differences that are felt to be so minor that the item can be treated as a near-equivalent, which can be described on a record that already exists.

Historical and current practice will be examined. The small amount of previous research on the question of the most reliable visible indicators of difference in manifestation will also be described. The question of appropriate record-structuring techniques to express differences between items will be considered. Finally, definitions of the following will be proposed: *manifestation*, *title manifestation*, and *near-equivalent*. First, historical and current practice will be examined in general terms.

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT PRACTICE

The practice of creating a new record for each new edition of a work goes back to the beginning of the use of unit records. Jewett's rule IV reads in part, "The whole title is to be repeated, for every distinct edition of the work" (Jewett 1852). Note, however, an equivalent rule concerning the object of a cataloging record is never stated explicitly in any published Anglo-American cataloging rules.

The development of a definition of *edition* in Anglo-American and international cataloging codes demonstrates an attempt to come to terms with technological change from the printing of books by the setting of type to the production of many different kinds of works, including books, by means of the many new methods of duplication and reproduction that have exploded into being in the course of the twentieth century. Cutter's fourth edition contained the following definition of *edition*: "A number of copies of a book, published at the same time and in the same form. A later publication of the same book unchanged is sometimes styled a different edition, sometimes a new issue, sometimes a different thousand (4th thousand, 7th thousand)" (Cutter 1904, 19). The 1908 rules were the first Anglo-American cataloging rules to adopt the bibliographers' definition of *edition*: "The whole number of copies printed from the same set of types and issued at the same time" (American Library Association 1908, xiv). In 1941, the definition was changed so as to remove the requirement that the copies be issued at the same time, in order to accommodate printing from stereotype or electrotype plates (ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee 1941, xix).

This definition remained essentially unchanged until 1974, when the first of the ISBDs *ISBD(M)* appeared, defining *edition* as "all the copies of a publication printed from one setting of type, or produced from one master copy, and issued by one publisher or group of publishers. (An edition may comprise several impressions or issues, in which there may be slight variations)" (IFLA Committee on Cataloguing 1974, 2). For the first time, a

definition had been devised that could be applied to nonbook materials not produced by the setting of type.

The current Anglo-American definition reads (ALA 1988, 617):

(*Books, pamphlets, fascicles, single sheets, etc.*) All copies produced from essentially the same type image (whether by direct contact or by photographic or other methods) and issued by the same entity.

(*Computer files*) All copies embodying essentially the same content and issued by the same entity.

(*Unpublished items*) All copies made from essentially the same original production (e.g., the original and carbon copies of a typescript).

(*Other materials*) All copies produced from essentially the same master copy and issued by the same entity. A change in the identity of the distributor does not mean a change of edition.

The latest *ISBD(M)* contains the following definition of *edition*: "All copies of a publication produced from substantially the same original input and issued by the same agency, whether by direct contact or by photographic or other methods" (IFLA Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme 1987, 3). The fact that the definition no longer refers to the setting of type seems to indicate an attempt to recognize the fact that catalogers have rarely been able to examine and compare type settings or type image, and that in fact they have relied on evidence on title pages and preliminaries, and on paging or other extent measurement, to determine when two items were two different editions of the same work.

Dorcas Fellows, in 1915, described the cataloging practice of adding editions subsequently acquired by a library to the card for the first edition acquired, using dashed-on entries (Fellows 1915, 132-37). This mention in 1915 might indicate that the use of dashed-on entries was practiced in the construction of card catalogs prior to its formal introduction into AACR in 1967, which allowed the more limited practice of dashed-on entries for different issues of a given edition or for reproductions (ALA 1967, 225-26). This practice may be considered to be a hold-

over of a long practice in book catalogs of describing subsequent editions of a work with dashes to represent all elements of the description that are the same as in previous editions; the British Museum catalog is perhaps the most readily available example of such a book catalog. The use of dashed-on entries is evidence of a desire not to confuse users with multiple entries for nearly identical items; in a dashed-on entry, only the significant differences in a new edition or issue are noted, and the inclusion of the dashed-on entry on an existing record quickly and concisely indicates to the user the degree to which the two items are identical.

The use of dashed-on entries is also evidence of a desire to create fewer records and to simplify cataloging. Further evidence of the latter is found in the 1949 rules, which state, "To distinguish the various issues of a given edition, any of a wide variety of details might need to be specified. However, at the Library of Congress it is not the policy, except in certain cases of rare books, to collect the various issues of a given edition and consequently no attempt is made to describe works in detail sufficient to identify them as issues. Various issues are added to the collection as copies if the description of the first one cataloged fits those received later in all details or in all details except the imprint date or the form of the publisher's name or both. If there are other differences, the issues are generally treated as different editions" (LC, Descriptive Cataloging Division 1949, 9).

From 1949 forward, less and less emphasis is placed on the distinction between issues and editions. The 1949 rules were the first to use the term *item*, as opposed to the more specific terms *edition* or *issue*, when referring to the object of a cataloging record: "The objectives of descriptive cataloging are (1) to state the significant features of an item with the purpose of distinguishing it from other items and describing its scope, contents, and bibliographic relation to other items . . ." (LC, Descriptive Cataloging Division 1949, 7). The term *item* is a neutral and ambiguous term that allows flexibility in determining what, in fact, to make the object of a

record. It was first defined, somewhat circularly, in the *ISBD(G)* as "a document, group of documents, or part of a document, in any physical form, considered as an entity and forming the basis of a single bibliographic description. The term *document* is used here in its widest sense" (IFLA International Office for UBC 1977, 2). The current Anglo-American definition of *item* is "a document or set of documents in any physical form, published, issued, or treated as an entity, and as such forming the basis for a single bibliographic description" (ALA 1988, 619). The use of the concept of *item* might represent a backing away from legislation in the cataloging code itself on what the object of a single description should be. Both the Library of Congress and the OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., have published fairly elaborate guidelines, which differ from each other, to enable the cataloger to decide when to make a new record (LC 1990; OCLC 1993, 37-49); both sets of guidelines attempt to identify differences on title pages and preliminaries or in physical description that should be considered so minor that it is not necessary to make a new record. These will be considered in more detail in the next section.

In summary, a historical review seems to reveal a trend away from use of the bibliographers' strict definition of edition to a definition that takes into account newer technologies for duplication, reproduction, and distribution of works. It also seems to reveal a reluctance to legislate in the cataloging codes on the issue of the object of a single cataloging record. And finally, it seems to indicate an attempt to devise methods to cut down on the number of cataloging records created to describe the various issues, variants, impressions, and reproductions of an edition of a work—in other words, to avoid creating new bibliographic records to describe minor variations between items. Perhaps the recent Multiple Versions Forum could be seen as an attempt to respond to these trends; here the recommendation was made that near-equivalents be cataloged on one record, using the new USMARC holdings format (Multiple Versions Fo-

rum 1990). The library community has recently limited the single-record approach to one type of near-equivalent, the reproduction (ALA, Task Force on Multiple Versions 1992). The tendency toward reducing the number of new records created seems to be in conflict, however, with the desire to simplify cataloging by teaching cataloging staffs to make a new record any time there is a difference in the publication statement, without discriminating, for example, between distributors and publishers, or among various types of date change.

TYPES OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MANIFESTATION OR NEAR-EQUIVALENT

Now that the historical context has been established and current practice has been defined, the types of difference that can occur from one manifestation to another or from one near-equivalent to another will be considered.

DIFFERENCE IN TITLE PAGE AND ITS CONNECTION WITH DIFFERENCE IN TEXT

Catalogers give much more weight to a difference in title page than do bibliographers. For bibliographers, the term *edition* is used quite strictly to mean "all copies resulting from a single job of typographical composition" (Tanselle 1975, 17) regardless of differences on the title page. It has long been recognized that two copies of the same edition, using the bibliographers' definition, can have different title pages. Bibliographers generally refer to such copies as *issues* or *states* (Gaskell 1972, 315-16). As far back as 1876, Cutter mentioned that such issues or states with different title pages were referred to by the Germans as *title-editions* (Cutter 1876, 61, rule 135; Cutter 1904, 19; see also LC, Processing Dept. 1946). It has long been recognized that the reverse can be true: that two different editions, that is two different settings of type, can be masked by identical title pages (LC, Processing Dept. 1946; Blanck 1966; Jolley 1961, 10).

Since 1908, Anglo-American catalog-

ing codes have incorporated definitions for *edition* similar to that used by bibliographers. Even though, as noted above, there is a trend away from the mention of settings of type, the current definition of *edition* for books in AACR2 still refers to type image: "In the case of books and booklike materials, all those copies of an item produced from substantially the same type image, whether by direct contact or by photographic methods" (ALA 1988, 617). In practice, however, Anglo-American catalogers do not in fact carry out textual comparisons to determine whether two items represent the same edition. It is very unusual for the cataloger of an item to look at more than its title page, preliminaries, overall paging and dimensions, and any readily available cataloging records that might serve as surrogates for other items that are candidates for representing the same edition. In other words, the Anglo-American cataloger is dependent on title page representation or representation elsewhere in the preliminaries of a work in making decisions about whether two items are copies of the same edition or two different editions. But title pages and preliminaries are not always reliable evidence. In some cases textual comparison of a number of different items, recorded in the form of elaborate collations, is necessary to determine whether two items are copies of the same edition, in the bibliographers' strict use of the term *edition*. Catalogers cannot afford to take the time to create elaborate collations for current publications. Some rare book collections can afford to create elaborate collations, but even in those collections, catalogers often are not able to assemble all the copies usually necessary to accurately classify editions, because, as Tanselle points out, "to establish such facts demands recourse to copies outside the collection" (Tanselle 1975, 17). The question arises, then, whether catalogers should retain the bibliographers' definition of *edition* when they do not have the resources to identify and distinguish editions to that degree of accuracy.

So far, only the question of what catalogers can reasonably hope to accomplish has been considered. The question of

whether their definition of *edition* corresponds to the needs of catalog users has not yet been considered. Since catalogers have been unable to implement the bibliographically accurate definition of *edition* carried in their glossaries all these years, they probably have been unable to satisfy the needs of those catalog users who are bibliographers and textual scholars. For example, William B. Todd (1981, 48) writes:

Without further analysis one may readily accept a report, from a major research library, that through 1955 Melville's *Moby Dick* ranged through 118 "editions." Upon proper investigation, however, one must conclude, with G. Thomas Tanselle, that all these NUC entries actually make up only thirty-five editions.

Rather than dwelling on this gloomy fact, however, one should consider the more cheerful possibility that perhaps current practice does meet the needs of many non-bibliographer catalog users. That is, the possibility should be considered that differences in title page representation, while they might not necessarily reflect actual differences in the setting of the type beneath, might nevertheless correspond to differences in citation and searching practice on the part of those catalog users who are not bibliographers.

In practice, bibliographers and rare book catalogers create two records for two items in the same edition with different title pages just as catalogers do. For example, in the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalog Project, the object of a record is not just an edition, but an issue or an impression. The real difference between catalogers and bibliographers lies in the degree to which bibliographers clarify the relationships between issues and editions, and use the terms according to their technical definitions, as compared to the tendency on the part of catalogers to simply report how an item describes itself as to edition, whether the publisher has been bibliographically accurate or not, and to report differences in title pages, but not differences in collation beyond changes in primary paging. ("The First Phase" 1983, 11; Alston 1981, 381).

There are several ways title page

representation can vary, and distinctions should be made. In cataloging most items, the following elements are transcribed when present: title and statement of responsibility, edition statement, imprint (called publication, distribution area in the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, second edition [AACR2]), and series.

Title Proper and Series Title

When two items have different titles, one can make a good argument for creating separate records for each, even if they are not two different editions in the bibliographer's use of the term; in fact, this has always been standard cataloging practice. The title is so important in citation practice that it is felt to be wise to record on separate records all the different titles under which a particular work has been issued. Another way of stating this argument is to say that issues or states with different titles on their title pages should be given separate records even though separate records are not normally made for different impressions, issues, or states. Besides the importance for matching users' citations to catalog records, another argument in favor of making separate records for title differences is that the records of these differences are of historical interest in themselves; they could enable historians and other scholars to trace the history of a particular work, including the various titles it has borne.

One could extend the same argument to cover differences in series titles. Series titles might sometimes warrant less bibliographic respect than title proper, however. A series title serves the dual functions of being (1) a unifying principle for a number of intellectually related works, and (2) a marketing tool for the publisher. Sometimes a series title performs very little of the former function and a great deal of the latter. The Library of Congress Rule Interpretation (LCRI) on when to make a new record indicates that a series title that is associated with just the soft-bound or just the hardbound manifestation of a Cataloging-in-Publication title can be ignored (LC 1990). The OCLC rules for when to make a new record indicate that any difference in name of the

series can be ignored, and an existing record that lacks the series, but is suitable in other respects for an item in hand, can be used (OCLC 1993, 47). However, OCLC's record matching algorithm *does* match on the series (O'Neill 1990, 11).

Edition and Imprint

A number of writers over the past century or more have noticed that certain differences on title pages have more to do with indicating continuing availability of a particular manifestation, rather than with any difference in the copies of the manifestation available. For example, publishers change dates and edition statements without changing the setting of the type, to indicate that in the new year the work is still available from the indicated publisher. For factual works, motives might be more unscrupulous, implying the work contained is more current than it is. Jewett noted the following phenomenon in 1853 (140):

It is frequently the case, that publishers, after having stereotyped a book, call every thousand copies of it a separate edition, and, for twenty or more editions, there may be no alteration in the book, except in the word expressing the number of the edition, and in the date. In such cases, it cannot be necessary to print a separate title for each pretended edition.

Differences in the various dates that appear on title pages, i.e., date of publication, copyright date, and printing date, are notorious for not reflecting an actual difference in edition. OCLC has six records for Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* published by Century, all with identical paging, the only differences being publication dates of 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907. One can be virtually certain that these are all the same edition, but different issues with different dates, in order to indicate continuing availability. The 1949 rules allowed two items that differ only in imprint date to be treated as copies and cataloged on the same record, unless copyright date varied as well (LC, Descriptive Cataloging Division 1949, 9). When the current Library of Congress rule interpretation was originally written in 1981, it forbade making a new record

when the only difference between two items was in the publication date, but this provision was dropped later in the same year (LC 1981, 3; LC 1990, 10). OCLC allows the cataloger to ignore differences in printing, manufacturing, distribution, or copyright dates, but not in publication dates (OCLC 1993, 46). Wanninger points out that many duplicates are created in OCLC because separate records with different reproduction dates are created for photocopies and microfilms produced on demand by University Microfilms International and the National Technical Information Service (Wanninger 1982). Edward T. O'Neill found that "the date of publication element, individually and in combination with other fields, was responsible for the greatest number of duplicate records," in a study of duplicate records in the OCLC database (O'Neill 1990, 11; O'Neill, Rogers, and Oskins 1993). He also found "the edition statement, in combination with other fields, was responsible for the highest percentage of duplicate records relative to the number of records in the sample in which it was present."

Sometimes two items are identical except for variations in the name of the publisher. The 1949 rules allowed two items to be described on the same record if the only difference between them was in the form of the publisher's name (LC, Descriptive Cataloging Division 1949, 9). The current LCRI distinguishes two cases: (1) variant forms of name used concurrently by the publisher, in which case two items can be described on one record; and (2) actual change in name of the publisher, in which case two items must be given two separate records (LC 1990, 10). OCLC allows the cataloger to ignore variation in fullness of publisher's name (OCLC 1993, 45), although its machine matching algorithm probably would not do so (O'Neill 1990, 11).

Beginning in the 19th century, the use of stereotype plates and electroplates for printing made it possible for the same edition in the bibliographers' sense, i.e., the same typesetting, to be issued by several different publishers or distributors (Steinberg 1974, 278-9). Now the various

photoreproduction processes available for all types of materials make this pattern of distribution widespread. Hagler describes the publishing practice of replacing the printed imprint on a title page by a label or stamp for the U.S. or Canadian publisher or distributor (Hagler 1963, 342). Several writers point out that it is not uncommon for issues of the same edition of a work to be issued with one imprint in England and another in the United States (McNellis 1985, 36; McPherson, Coyle, and Montgomery 1982, 376). Changing distributors are particularly common with nonbook materials (Fothergill and Butchart 1978, 180; Thaxter 1983, 19). In fact, the definition of edition for nonbook materials in AACR2R (based on ISBD) indicates that "a change in the identity of the distributor does not mean a change of edition" (ALA 1988, 617). Unfortunately, this particular provision of AACR2 has not been put into practice; OCLC, for example, requires making a new record when the distributor changes (OCLC 1993, 45); as a result, OCLC contains numerous records for videocassettes of the same film.

Is it really necessary to create separate catalog records to record variation in date of issue, copyright date, or printing date; or variation in distributor; or variation in the name of the publisher, when there is no reason to suspect that the variation is associated with an actual difference in the intellectual content? Catalog records are expensive to create. They are also expensive to maintain in large databases. Most importantly, multiple catalog records for virtually identical items confuse users, including library staff, such as copy catalogers and interlibrary loan assistants. It takes the user a long time to sort through a large retrieval set. Any given search is likely to bring up larger numbers of records than if these near-equivalents were weeded out. The fact that multiple records exist is likely to blind users to the fact that a number of items listed separately are virtually interchangeable for most purposes. Differences in distributor and issue date that are unconnected to any differences in the content are likely of interest only to someone who would like to acquire a copy of a particular

manifestation at any given point in time. Surely sources such as *Books in Print* are more appropriate and more up-to-date for this kind of information than catalog databases can ever hope to be. There is one caveat, however: users who need to find a particular edition because they have a citation to a particular page number would benefit if variations in distributor and date were recorded as near-equivalent-specific variations, so that they could be assured they have found the manifestation with the paging they seek.

DIFFERENCE IN RESPONSIBILITY OR OTHER DIFFERENCES SUBSTANTIAL ENOUGH TO CREATE A VERSION

Sometimes a manifestation can have its own manifestations. Panizzi recognized this in his rules for the arrangement of various manifestations under an author. For example, a particular translation of a particular work could itself go into several editions. Thus Panizzi's rule LXX read, "Editions by the same editor, or such as are expressly stated to follow a specific text or edition, and editions with the same notes or commentary, to succeed each other immediately in their chronological order after the entry of that which is, or is considered to be, the earliest."

Rule LXXII, dealing with the arrangement of translations, reads, in part, "Translations into the same language, and their several editions, to be entered in conformity with the rules laid down for the entries of the originals" (Panizzi 1985, 11). This kind of grouping together of all the manifestations of a manifestation was never attempted in card catalogs, but one wonders whether it could be done in online catalogs.

The "manifestations of manifestations" under discussion tend to exhibit authorship connected with the manifestation rather than with the work itself. The kind of authorship that can change without causing change in the work itself has been called subsidiary authorship since the introduction of the ISBDs (ALA 1974, 24). Examples of subsidiary authors are editors, translators, authors of introductions or notes, compilers of attached bib-

liographies, commentators, illustrators, etc. Manifestations that themselves have manifestations do not always have subsidiary authors, however. Sometimes a single author or other creator can create several different versions, or manifestations of one of his works, each of which can then go into several manifestations. Ravilious mentions the "1919 version of Stravinsky's *Firebird Suite*," and Whiting mentions Wordsworth's versions of the *Guide to the Lakes* (Ravilious 1975, 47; Whiting 1980, 5). Thus, several writers have suggested that a conceptual level between *work* and *manifestation* is needed, perhaps to be called *version* (Domanovszky 1974, 102; Du Rietz 1974, 84; Richmond 1980, 33; Shinebourne 1979, 240; Whiting 1980, 5).

Barbara Tillett refers to the types of versions described here as having either derivative relationships to their parent works, or descriptive relationships. "Derivative relationships are those [that] hold between a bibliographic item and a modification based on that item. . . . One item is derived from another when it enlarges, abridges, or otherwise modifies the entire item or portions of it" (Tillett 1987, 43). However, she includes adaptations in this category, while adaptations are generally treated as new works rather than as manifestations. She also includes editions, in the sense of resetting of type without differences in subsidiary authorship, which have been discussed above. "A descriptive relationship holds between a bibliographic item [or] work and a description, criticism, evaluation, or review of that item or work, such as that between an item and a book review describing it" (Tillett 1987, 57). Although most items in this category are new works *about* other works, Tillett includes here editions with commentary, which are sometimes treated as manifestations of the same work, depending on the circumstances.

DIFFERENCE IN EXTENT

It has long been recognized that difference in extent, such as difference in the paging of a book, can be with some frequency the only reliable clue that two items are significantly different. Differ-

ence in the paging of a book is a sure sign the type has been reset. Resetting of type can easily lead to either intentional or unintentional alteration of the text. Research done at the Library of Congress in 1946, to be discussed further below, clearly demonstrated that for books, paging was the most reliable clue for detecting differences in edition, i.e., resettings of type. A difference in the paging of a book might well be of interest to even the general user. As has been said, it might indicate significant alteration of the text itself. However, even if the resetting of the type, which creates the new paging, has not altered the text, the user might need to find the correct manifestation in order to look up a citation to a particular page number.

DIFFERENCE IN PHYSICAL FORMAT

Sometimes the only difference between one item and another is a difference in physical format. This can be due to reproduction, in which a copy of an original is made for preservation or conservation purposes, or to make it available in another useful format. It can also be due to simultaneous release in more than one format, in order to reach different markets. Examples would be a microform of a text, CD and audiocassette releases of a sound recording, or a videocassette copy of a motion picture. Sometimes reproductions are made on a one-time basis either by a particular institution for preservation purposes, or by an on-demand reproduction agency such as University Microfilms International or the National Technical Information Service. Other times multiple copies or reproductions are issued and made available by a reproduction/distribution agency. In any case, the purpose for reproduction or simultaneous release in several formats is to produce a surrogate for the item reproduced in order to make it more widely or readily available. Certainly difference in physical format is of interest to users and should be communicated to them, but whether it is necessary to create a completely separate bibliographic record to communicate this difference is open to question. Libraries

have traditionally used holdings statements, dashed-on entries, or other similar techniques to communicate such information rather than asserting that such a difference created a new edition, requiring a new record. The practice of adding reproductions to existing records by means of dashed-on entries was actually codified in AACR in 1967 (ALA 1967, 225-26). The Library of Congress does not explicitly address the question of difference in physical format in its rule interpretation for AACR2 rule 1.0 (LC 1990, 10); in practice, however, as long as Processing Services at the Library of Congress was cataloging audiovisual materials for the libraries of the nation (a service no longer provided by LC), the LC catalogers made a new record only for a difference in general material designation (motion picture versus videorecording), and summarized all videorecording formats available on one record (Tucker 1982). The archival moving-image catalogers at LC attach both videorecordings and motion pictures to one record if the only difference is in physical format. OCLC, on the other hand, encourages the creation of two records if there are differences in the physical description between one item and another (OCLC 1993, 46-47). The probable explanation for this approach is that one of OCLC's primary goals is to support interlibrary loan, in which a potential borrower needs to know precisely what the physical format of the item to be borrowed is. Since the utilities have never had a holdings format to allow the communication within a single record of information about which formats are held by which institutions, their only recourse has been to fall back on encouraging the creation of a new bibliographic record for every variation in physical description. Now that a USMARC holdings format exists, with a repeatable 007, the opportunity exists to develop a hierarchically structured single record to show differences in physical format. A hierarchically structured single-record approach would cut down on repetition of bibliographic data when all that is different is the physical format.

An unresolved difficulty with a hierarchically structured record is that of deciding what to describe primarily when the item reproduced is not in hand, or when no one item has primacy, as in the case of simultaneous release of several formats. The two-tiered approach advocated by the Multiple Versions Forum requires that one item be designated primary with its physical description given in the first tier; physical descriptions of derivative reproduced items are given in the second tier. If a library has only a reproduction but not the original, it must construct some sort of physical description for an item it does not have. If the technique were ever to be extended to simultaneous publications, e.g., an audiocassette and a CD issued at the same time, one of these physical formats would have to be arbitrarily designated primary and described in the first tier. A more effective solution might be to allow the physical description fields to be repeated on the second tier, and to allow the first tier to exist without a "primary" physical description.

Barbara Tillett includes physical variants in the category of equivalence relationships, which she defines as follows: "Equivalence relationships are those [that] hold (1) between exact copies of the same manifestation of a work or (2) between an original work and reproductions of it, as long as intellectual content and authorship are preserved" (Tillett 1987, 27).

Sometimes rather substantive differences can take place in physical format, especially when audio or visual works are transferred from one medium to another. A sound recording can change from stereo to monophonic in the course of the transfer. A film that is transferred onto video can experience considerable degradation of image. A still photograph in color can experience a considerable shift in color values in the course of reproduction. It can certainly be argued that these differences represent significant difference in the intellectual or artistic content. However, if the differences resulting from this kind of change are the only differences between two items, and the differences can be clearly indicated in the physical description, a more economical way to

communicate the differences might be to make one record for both items, with repeated physical descriptions, rather than creating two full bibliographic records that differ only in the physical description. This approach is more economical for database managers to the extent that the cost of managing large databases is increased by having to store, retrieve, and arrange large numbers of near-equivalent records; it is more economical to database users to the extent that they are charged for online searching time, or for the number of records they must access in order to make decisions about usefulness of the records for their purposes; if the user's time is considered valuable in its own right, it is more economical to summarize the differences on one record than to make the user look back and forth between two records to see what the differences are.

RECORD-MATCHING ALGORITHMS

In the section above, OCLC's record-matching algorithm has been mentioned occasionally, and it has been compared to OCLC's policies for catalogers concerning when to make a new record. Record-matching algorithms are programs used in large bibliographic databases that collect records from many different sources (Coyle 1984; Coyle 1985; Coyle and Galaher-Brown 1985; Hickey and Rypka 1979; Klemperer 1978; MacLaury 1979; McPherson, Coyle, and Montgomery 1982; O'Neill 1990; O'Neill 1991; Williams and MacLaury 1979). The function of a record-matching algorithm is to identify duplicate records, records that represent the same manifestation of the same work. There is some evidence that these are being designed to try to deal with near-equivalency; for example, most match only on certain characters in the title field, not all characters (Coyle 1985, 59). However, there is always the possibility that such algorithms might lead to some merging of items that are truly different manifestations, and also to lack of recognition of near-equivalencies that appear different to the algorithms. Some research on the validity and reliability of these algorithms is currently being done

at OCLC. O'Neill reports their current algorithm has a precision of .93, if the record similarity is set to .9 (O'Neill 1990, 13-14); in other words, 93% of the identified pairs were duplicates, and presumably seven per cent of the pairs identified as duplicates were not. However, the accompanying recall was only .51; in other words, the algorithm identified only 51% of the duplicates in the sample. Unfortunately, the similarity measure is not described. Seven percent of pairs falsely merged seems of some significance and might not be tolerable in a high-quality database.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON VISIBLE INDICATORS OF MANIFESTATIONS

In 1946, the Library of Congress published research on the frequency with which title pages and collations of books could be relied upon to indicate whether two books containing the same work are the same edition or not (LC, Processing Dept. 1946). The Library studied 49 groups of books that had different title pages, i.e., that seemed to be different editions, based on examination of the title page, but had the same paging. The study revealed that of these 49 groups, 40 consisted of either issues, reprints, type-facsimiles or copies, rather than true editions, with reset type. In other words, there were a number of cases in which paging was a more reliable clue than title page variation as to whether two items actually represented different editions.

Svenonius and O'Neill are engaged in a study of a sample of works from the OCLC database, but their results have not yet been published (Svenonius and O'Neill 1988). The purpose of the study is to determine whether it is possible to predict from clues easily accessible to the cataloger, such as paging or title page transcription, when two items are the same work, text, or edition, i.e., typesetting. Barbara Tillett's doctoral research on bibliographic relationships includes a study of the frequency with which equivalence, derivative and descriptive relationships are noted in cataloging done at the Library of Congress between 1968 and 1986

(Tillett 1987). Unfortunately only those relationships that are revealed by way of either explicit edition statements, explicit notes by the cataloger, or USMARC format coding were studied, and even those with explicit notes were only sampled. Differences between manifestations that are revealed indirectly, for example, by a statement of subsidiary authorship in the 245 field or by other such implicit indications—e.g., two items with the same title and authorship but two different dates of publication and extent statements, i.e., paging—were thus excluded from study. These are relatively important and frequently occurring categories of manifestation. The major value of the study lies in the intellectual analysis of the types of relationships and the way they are communicated in catalog records under current practice.

RECORD-STRUCTURING TECHNIQUES

One of the objectives of descriptive cataloging is to communicate to users any differences between items that are known to the cataloger and that might be of significance to most users. Conversely, insignificant differences should not be made to look as if they were significant. A second goal is to communicate these differences as economically and concisely as possible (ALA 1967, 189). It seems self-evident that the communication of a significant difference to users with a single line of text is preferable to the communication of a significant difference with two full computer screens of data that differ in only one line of text. In the latter case, the users have to spend a good deal more time reading in order to figure out what the difference is. Some differences can affect a number of areas of the description; an example is a language difference between two film manifestations that can lead to the title and credits being in a different language, and to the need to code differently a number of areas in the USMARC format. At times differences can be of equal significance to the user, but that difference can be communicated with a single phrase in the physical description; an example might be the difference

SYNC01-OJPRISM JBLKJ J J J
 Search Edit View Actions Options
 Beginning of record displayed. SID: 04036 OL

OLUC dt pat,,,/med Record 87 of 316
 NO HOLDINGS IN CLU - 34 OTHER HOLDINGS
 OCLC: 4599336 Rec stat: c
 Entered: 19790130 Replaced: 19870805 Used: 19920217
 Type: g Bib lvl: m Source: d Lang: eng
 Type mat: v Enc lvl: I Govt pub: Ctry: miu
 Int lvl: g Mod rec: Tech: 1 Leng: 171
 Desc: i Accomp: Dat tp: r Dates: 1978,1969
 1 040 GZR c GZR d m.c. d OCL
 2 007 v b f d c e b f a g h h o
 3 019 4599427
 4 045 x4x4
 5 090 b
 6 049 CLUM
 7 245 00 Patton. h [Videorecording] / c Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.
 8 260 Farmington Hills, Mich. : b Magnetic Video Corp., c 1978, [made 1969]
 9 300 2 cassettes, 171 min. : b sd., col. ; c 1/2 in.
 10 500 VHS.
 11 500 A videocassette release of the motion picture.

SYNC01-OJPRISM JBLKJ J J J
 Search Edit View Actions Options
 End of record displayed. SID: 04036 OL

OLUC dt pat,,,/med Record 87 of 316
 NO HOLDINGS IN CLU - 34 OTHER HOLDINGS
 12 500 Based on factual material from the books Patton: ordeal and triumph, by Ladislav Farago, and A soldier's story, by Omar N. Bradley.
 13 511 George C. Scott, Karl Malden.
 14 508 Producer, Frank McCarthy; director, Franklin J. Schaffner; screenplay, Francis Ford Coppola, Edmund H. North; music, Jerry Goldsmith.
 15 520 Adventure drama of World War II American general George S. Patton.
 16 600 10 Patton, George S. q (George Smith), d 1885-1945 x Drama. w cn
 17 700 11 Farago, Ladislav. t Patton: ordeal and triumph. w cn
 18 700 11 Bradley, Omar Nelson, d 1893- t A soldier's story. w dn
 19 710 21 Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation. w cn

Figure 1, page 1

between the 70 millimeter and the panned-and-scanned non-wide-screen manifestation of a film.

There are at least three techniques that could be used to indicate differences that are deemed significant. The first, the separate record technique, is currently the most widely used. The second, the two- or three-tiered hierarchical technique, is currently being considered for adoption for the description of reproductions, a type of near-equivalent (Multiple

Versions Forum 1990; ALA, Task Force on Multiple Versions 1992). The third, the four- or five-tiered hierarchical technique, is not currently used in library cataloging, but has been in the past in book catalogs.

THE SEPARATE RECORD TECHNIQUE

Using the separate record technique, a new record is made for every different manifestation of a work. Differences are

SYNC01-OJPRISM JBLKJ J J J
 Search Edit View Actions Options
 Beginning of record displayed. SID: 04036 OL

OLUC dt pat,,,/med Record 260 of 316
 NO HOLDINGS IN CLU - 18 OTHER HOLDINGS
 OCLC: 9333787 Rec stat: n
 Entered: 19830322 Replaced: 19890505 Used: 19920609
 Type: g Bib lvl: m Source: d Lang: eng
 Type mat: v Enc lvl: K Govt pub: Ctry: miu
 Int lvl: Mod rec: Tech: 1 Leng: 171
 Desc: a Accomp: Dat tp: r Dates: 1982,1969
 1 040 YPL c YPL d m/c
 2 092 791.43 b War, P
 3 090 b
 4 049 CLUM
 5 245 00 Patton h Videorecording / c Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.; producer, Frank McCarthy; director, Franklin J. Schaffner; screen story and screenplay, Francis Ford Coppola, Edmund H. North; music, Jerry Goldsmith.
 6 260 Farmington Hills, Michigan : b 20th Century-Fox Video, c c1982.
 7 300 2 video cassettes (VHS) (171 min.) : b sd., col., ; c 12 in.
 8 511 1 George C. Scott, Karl Malden.
 9 500 Videodisc release of the 1969 motion picture by 20th Century-Fox.

SYNC01-OJPRISM JBLKJ J J J
 Search Edit View Actions Options
 End of record displayed. SID: 04036 OL

OLUC dt pat,,,/med Record 260 of 316
 NO HOLDINGS IN CLU - 18 OTHER HOLDINGS
 10 500 Based on the books: Patton ordeal and triumph, by Ladislav Farago, and A soldier's story, by Omar N. Bradley.
 11 520 The World War II adventures of the controversial American general, George S. Patton.
 12 500 Rated : PG
 13 600 10 Patton, George S. q (George Smith), d 1885-1945. w cn
 14 650 0 Feature films.
 15 650 0 War films.
 16 650 0 Video recordings. w cn
 17 710 21 Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation. w cn

Figure 1, page 2

indicated to users by the fact that two records are identical except at the points where the differences between two manifestations are being described. A record thus describes an item in such a way as to identify it as being in some ways the same as another item or group of items and distinguishes it as being in some ways different from another item or group of items. This technique is currently used for true manifestations, for title manifestations, and for near-equivalents that differ in physical format for reasons other than

reproduction, or that differ in distribution information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this technique. The records in the examples were all found in OCLC. Under this technique, users who are trying to sort out the various manifestations of a work must read through each description to see how it differs from the others; this involves reading through much repetitive information, describing the aspects of a given manifestation that are actually the same for all manifestations.

THE TWO- OR THREE-TIERED
HIERARCHICAL TECHNIQUE

The very fact that two items are described on two records is a signal that significant differences exist. Systems that allow duplicate records, i.e., two records describing the same manifestation, are confusing to users for this reason. If two items are described on the same record, the implicit message is that their intellectual and artistic content is exactly the same. Under the two- or three-tiered hierarchical technique, two items that do not differ in intellectual and artistic content, but only in physical format, are described on the same record; differences in physical format are described in dependent near-equivalent records attached to the main catalog record. If there are differences in the visible indicators associated with mere difference in physical format, these, too, can be indicated in the dependent near-equivalent records. The two- or three-tiered hierarchical technique is currently being proposed as a two-tiered technique to deal with reproductions. The two tiers consist of the catalog record and the dependent records that describe both various near-equivalents and various copies held. Many think that for this new technique to work, it will have to be *three-tiered* on implementation, with the second tier, the near-equivalent tier, identifying various near-equivalents available, and the third tier, the holdings tier, consisting of copies held and locations attached to the appropriate near-equivalent record.

The current implementation of the two- or three-tiered hierarchical technique requires that one near-equivalent be designated as the original, to be described in the bibliographic record itself. All other near-equivalents, those described at the second tier, are considered to be derived from the original. See figure 2 for an example taken from the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions* adopted by the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CCDA) at the ALA Annual Meeting in July 1992. Because of the need to designate an original, this model works well

only for reproductions, and even there, only for reproductions of originals that have already been completely described. Difficulties arise when one has to try to describe a reproduction without complete information about the original from which it derived. If the use of this technique is to be extended to other kinds of near-equivalents, such as simultaneous publications in different physical formats, or near-equivalents with different distributors and distribution dates, the technique will probably have to be modified to accommodate near-equivalents of equal status, i.e., with no identifiable original. See figure 3 for an example of a catalog record created at the UCLA Film and Television Archive, where no attempt is made to identify an original.

THE FOUR- OR FIVE-TIERED
HIERARCHICAL TECHNIQUE

The four/five-tiered hierarchical technique is a technique that was used in the old book catalogs. If it is conceived of as a four-tiered technique, the four tiers would be work—manifestation—near-equivalent—holding; if it is conceived of as a five-tiered technique, the fifth tier would be version in the old sense, that is, a manifestation that itself has manifestations, such as the various editions of a particular translation of a work. The five tiers would then be work—version—manifestation—near-equivalent—holding. In a sense, the unit of cataloging was the work. Once a user located a work in which he was interested, he could see displayed the various versions, texts, editions, and physical variants of that work subarranged by language or subsidiary author and then by date. In other words, records were arranged in such a way that manifestations that were most alike were close together, and manifestations that were most different were farthest apart. Concise entries for each version, text, etc., indicated only how it differed from those above it. Thus it was easy for a user to scan multiple entries and make an efficient choice of the best manifestation to suit his or her purposes, in a listing of all the manifestations of a given work. See figure

14. Video reproduction of a 35 mm film (*etc.*) indicates portions of record here omitted for the sake of brevity)

She wore a yellow ribbon [motion picture] / RKO ; producers, John Ford, Merian C. Cooper ; associate producer, Lowell Farrell ; director, John Ford ; screenplay, Frank Nugent, Laurence Stallings. -- United States : RKO, c1949.
6 film reels (103 min.) : sd., col. ; 35 mm.
Author, James Warner Bellah.

Cast: John Wayne, Joanne Dru, John Agar, Ben Johnson, Harry Carey, Jr., Victor McLaglen, Mildred Natwick, George O'Brien, Arthur Shields, Harry Woods, Chief Big Tree, Noble Johnson, Cliff Lyons, Tom Tyler, Michael Dugan, Mickey Simpson, Frank McGrath, Don Summer, Fred Libbey, Jack Pennick, Billy Jones, Bill Goettinger, Fred Graham, Fred Kennedy, Rudy Bowman, Post Parks, Ray Hyke, Lee Bradley.

Credits: Art director, James Basevi; musical director, C. Bakaleinikoff; photography, Winton Hoch; editor, Jack Murray.

All credits were supplied from: Film daily yearbook, 1950.

Safety film base; optical sound; filmed using the 3-color Technicolor process; Eastman-color print.

Original running time was 103 min., according to: Film daily yearbook, 1950.

I. Ford, John, 1894-1973. II. Cooper, Merian C. III. Nugent, Frank. IV. Stallings, Laurence, 1894-1968. V. Wayne, John, 1907-1979. VI. Dru, Joanne, 1923- VII. Agar, John, 1921- [*etc.*]

■ FILM ARCHIVES -- MP 619 -- Reel 1-6

Reproduction (videocassette): [Los Angeles, Ca. : Taped by UCLA Film and Television Archives, 1988]

1 videocassette (103 min.) : sd., col. ; 1/2 in. VHS.

■ AUDIOVISUAL -- VC 201

Figure 2

4 for an example from the British Museum book catalog.

The four- or five-tiered hierarchical technique has not been used since the days of the book catalog, prior to the advent of the environment in which we now live, dominated by the unit record, by shared cataloging, and by multiple national databases. Such conglomerated records, representing a work with the editions held described in four or five tiers, would be difficult to use in shared cataloging the way it is currently practiced, because each collection would hold different manifestations, and would have to re-edit and replace the whole work record

each time it added a manifestation. The Multiple Versions Forum might represent a move in the direction of the four- or five-tiered hierarchical technique, although the two-tiered approach that does not clearly differentiate between near-equivalent-specific information and holding-specific information, but lumps them together on the second tier, is not yet a very elegant solution. So far, the library community has taken a very conservative approach to defining the scope of potential application of the two-tiered approach, limiting it to reproductions.

In the unit record, shared cataloging, multiple national database environment

COMMAND->

Type HELP or press PF1 for options.

 -- Long Display Screen
 Record D13 of 2316 Screen 1 of 8

After tomorrow / Fox Film Corporation ; Frank Borzage production ; directed by
 Frank Borzage ; screen play by Sonya Levien. United States : Fox, c1932.

Drama; feature.

"Based on the stage play by John Golden and Hugh S. Stange."

The players: Charles Farrell, Marian Nixon, Minna Gombell, William Collier,
 Sr.; Josephine Hull; William Pawley; Greta Granstedt; Ferdinand Munier; Nora
 Lane.

CREDITS: Photography by James Howe; sound recorder, George Leverett; art
 director, William Darling; costumes by Guy S. Duty; music by James Hanley.
 (Editor, Margaret Clancy, i.e. Clancey).

Production credit in brackets supplied from Copyright catalog, 1912-1939.

"Western Electric System."

Playing time on release was 79 min., according to: Film daily yearbook, 1933.
 End of last reel contains exit music.

Press ENTER for the Next Screen

Current Search: fsu ucla preservation
 COMMAND->

Type HELP or press PF1 for options.

 -- Long Display Screen
 Record D13 of 2316 Screen 2 of 8

After tomorrow

Copyright: Fox Film Corp.; 12Feb32; LP2881.

"Passed by National Board of Review."

PROGRAM NOTES: Charles Farrell and Marian Nixon star as two young people
 prevented from marrying by the selfishness of their parents in an adaptation
 of a play by John Golden and Hugh S. Stange. For many years, this film was
 thought to be lost, until the last surviving nitrate print was discovered in
 the Fox vaults and turned over to the UCLA Film and Television Archive to be
 copied for preservation. With Minna Gombell, William Collier, Sr., and
 Josephine Hull (later famous as one of the two murdering aunts in Arsenic
 and old lace) recreating a role she had played on the stage.

PRESERVATION HISTORY: Preserved at UCLA.

GENRE(S): Features.

SUBJECT(S): UCLA preservation.

Press ENTER for the Next Screen

Current Search: fsu ucla preservation
 COMMAND->

Type HELP or press PF1 for options.

 -- Long Display Screen
 Record D13 of 2316 Screen 3 of 8

Figure 3, page 1

in which we have been living for the past century, it is difficult to devise elegant solutions. Perhaps it would do no harm to dream of a distant future in which all libraries share a single virtual catalog, with searching and display mechanisms for library patrons that could, on demand, suppress items not in the local collection. Part of the cataloger's task would be to

determine where a new manifestation of a work should fit among other manifestations of that work, and to devise a concise description that indicated only how it differed from other manifestations. Once this record had been fitted into place, its place in the arrangement of all manifestations would be fixed for all users of the catalog. In effect, we could share not just

After tomorrow

OTHER ENTR(IES): 1. Borzage, Frank. 2. Levien, Sonya, 1898-1960. 3.
 Howe, James Wong. 4. Leverett, George. 5. Darling, William, b. 1882.
 6. Duty, Guy S. 7. Hanley, James F. (James Frederick), 1892-1942. 8.
 Clancey, Margaret. 9. Farrell, Charles, 1901- 10. Nixon, Marian, 1904-
 11. Gombell, Minna, 1892-1973. 12. Collier, William, 1866-1944. 13. Hull,
 Josephine, 1886-1957. 14. Golden, John, 1874-1955. 15. Stange, Hugh
 Stanislaus. 16. Fox Film Corporation.

COP(IES) HELD IN FILM COLLECTION:

1. 35 mm. nitrate print. 9 reels of 9 (79 min.) (ca. 9000 ft.) : opt sd.,
 b&w

AVAILABILITY: Individual use only; no projection.

NOTES: Studio print. Old Archives location no.: 46-AA-2.

Press ENTER for the Next Screen

Current Search: fsu ucla preservation
 COMMAND->

Type HELP or press PF1 for options.

 -- Long Display Screen
 Record D13 of 2316 Screen 4 of 8

After tomorrow

CONDITION: Poor condition: single-system work print used as projection
 print; splice at every cut (Booth condition report, 4/17/86).
 LOCATION: R-F63-R13-1 INVENTORY NO: M15105

2. 35 mm. safety print. 5 reels of 5 (ca. 9000 ft.) : opt sd., b&w
 AVAILABILITY: Projection only; no individual viewing.
 NOTES: Copy added from inventory record without viewing or inspection.
 CONDITION: Missing footage compared to 79 min. original release length?
 Running time supplied by Booth. Excellent condition (Melnitz cond.
 report, 7/27/1989).
 REPRODUCTION: Reproduced by UCLA Film and Television Archive from 35
 mm. safety prsv comp dupe neg (XFES04 -512 M). Reproduction for
 preservation purposes permitted by Twentieth Century-Fox, 1982.
 Press ENTER for the Next Screen

Current Search: fsu ucla preservation
 COMMAND->

Type HELP or press PF1 for options.

 -- Long Display Screen
 Record D13 of 2316 Screen 5 of 8

After tomorrow

LOCATION: R-A3-124-3 INVENTORY NO: M35412

2. 35 mm. safety print. 1 reel of 8 (ca. 1000 ft.) : opt sd., b&w
 NOTES: Copy added from inventory record without viewing or inspection.
 CONDITION: Incomplete.

Figure 3, page 2

unit records, but decisions about the relationships of multiple unit records. Or perhaps it would be possible to devise some other way to record and share information about how an item being cataloged is related to other items already cataloged in the national databases. Current techniques for relating, involving alphabetic matching on main entries, do not work

well for machine linking, because so many works are given title main entries under AACR2 rules, and there are so many cases of different works that have the same title.

Because the four- or five-tiered hierarchical technique is currently impractical, the following discussion of recommended cataloging techniques assumes a choice between the separate record technique

SMOLLET (TOBIAS GEORGE)

—— See WRIGHT (Thomas) *M.A., F.S.A.* History of the reigns of George IV, and William IV., being a continuation of Hume, Smollett, and Miller's History of England, etc. [ca. 1838]. 1500/88.
pp. xi, 637. 8°.

AN ESSAY ON THE EXTERNAL USE OF WATER.

—— An essay on the external use of water. In a letter to Dr. ^{oooo} with particular remarks upon the present method of using the mineral waters at Bath in Somersetshire, etc. London: printed for M. Cooper; sold by D. Wilson: Bath: sold by Leake & Frederick, 1752. C. 123. k. 3.
pp. 48. 4°.

—— [Another edition.] Edited, with introduction and notes, by Claude E. Jones. Reprinted from Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine, etc. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. 7483. r. 10.
pp. 31–82: plate; port. 37 cm.

THE EXPEDITION OF HUMPHRY CLINKER

—— The expedition of Humphry Clinker. By the author of Roderick Random. London: W. Johnston; Salisbury: B. Collins, 1671 [1771]. C. 95 sa. 8.
3 vol. 13°.
The date is correctly printed in vol. 2, 3.
Anonymous.

—— The expedition of Humphry Clinker. By the author of Roderick Random. The second edition. London: W. Johnston; Salisbury: B. Collins, 1771. C. 175. m. 15.
3 vol. 12°. Δ
Anonymous.

—— [Another edition.] Dublin: A. Leathley, etc. 1771. 1484. bbb. 11.
3 vol. 12°.
Anonymous.

—— [Another edition.] Dublin: A. Leathley, etc. 1771. 1478. c. 41.
3 vol. 12°.
Anonymous. Vol. 2 is a duplicate of the preceding.

—— The second edition. London: W. Johnston; Salisbury: B. Collins, 1772. 12614. see. 9.
3 vol. 12°.
Anonymous.

—— [Another edition.] Dublin: A. Leathley, etc., 1774. 12612. dd. 13.
2 vol. 12°.
Anonymous.

—— The expedition of Humphry Clinker, etc. 1775. See supra: [Collections.] The select works of T. Smollet, etc. vol. 7, 8. 1776. 12°. 1578/1925.
Δ

Anonymous.

—— The expedition of Humphry Clinker. By the author of Roderick Random. London: W. Johnston; Salisbury: B. Collins, 1779. 1807/4538.
2 vol. 8°. Δ

—— The expedition of Humphry Clinker, etc. London: T. Becket; J. Pridden, 1681 [1781]. 1807/3762.
2 vol. 12°. Δ
Anonymous.

—— [Another edition.] Dublin: J. Ezshaw, etc., 1781. 012642. pp. 86.
2 vol. 12°.
Anonymous.

—— The third edition. London: T. Longman, and G. Robinson, 1683 [1783]. 12650. a. 78.
3 vol. 12°.
Anonymous.

—— [Another edition.] Dublin: W. Sleater, etc., 1784, 85. 1471. de. 44.
2 vol. 12°.
Anonymous.

and the two- or three-tiered hierarchical technique.

PROPOSED DEFINITIONS

Based on the above discussions of user needs, the following definitions are proposed:

Manifestation: The set of all items that represent the same work and do not differ in intellectual and artistic content from each other in a way that would be considered significant by most users of the collection. An example of an insignificant difference in intellectual and artistic content, i.e. one that would not create a new manifestation, might be correction of typesetting errors or misspellings. An example of significant difference in intellectual and artistic content, i.e., one that would create a new manifestation, is creation of a distinct manifestation by the original author, e.g., a revised edition.

Title manifestation: The set of all items that represent the same manifestation of the same work and that have identical chief sources of information, other than distribution information; two items that have the same intellectual and artistic content, but differ in title or statement of responsibility, are two different title manifestations.

Near-equivalent: The set of all items that represent the same manifestation of the same work and that have identical distribution information and physical characteristics; two items that have the same intellectual and artistic content and identical chief sources of information other than distribution information, but differ in distribution information, such as edition statement, publisher, distributor, or date, or in physical characteristics, such as paper, type, binding, film base, or medium of reproduction, are two different near-equivalents.

If we could adopt the definitions above, we could cut down considerably on the number of near-equivalents cluttering our databases. A principled approach could be taught as follows: Make a new record only if title, authorship or extent (paging for books) changes; if the only change is in publisher, date or physical

format, do not make a new record. This approach could both save money and help users.

MOVING-IMAGE MATERIALS

Above, we have attempted to define *manifestation*, *title manifestation*, and *near-equivalent* in general terms that would apply to all materials. Now, the kinds of differences that can occur between manifestations or near-equivalents of moving-image works, and that might be significant to users, will be discussed and categorized based on the previously developed definitions.

There is much anecdotal evidence in the film literature concerning the existence of various manifestations. The rights to most moving-image materials belong to for-profit corporations that are perfectly willing to edit these works to be shown to various markets in various formats, as long as they think a profit can be made. Prior to the era of television, companies such as Film Classics and Realart Pictures acquired the rights to distribute older studio titles to neighborhood theaters and drive-ins to fill out double features. According to McElwee, cuts would be made when necessary to accommodate time limitations in the double-feature format (McElwee 1990, pt. 3, 140). When television became a medium of distribution for films, they were edited to remove profanity, sex, violence and product identifications (if Lucky Strike was a sponsor, Humphrey Bogart couldn't be seen smoking Camels), and then footage was either added or removed to enable them to fit into standard time slots between commercials; wide-screen films would be "panned and scanned," a process in which only a portion of the wide-screen image is selected for showing on the small TV screen (Haserot 1989, 49). Airline manifestations are edited for sex, violence (especially airplane crashes), language, and length.

Sometimes different manifestations were created for censorship reasons. In the early days of states' rights distribution of motion pictures, each state had its own censorship board; in effect, there were state-specific manifestations of each

work. Pre-code 1930s films were cut prior to reissue or rerelease (McElwee 1990, pt. 3, 139). Foreign films of the fifties and sixties were felt to be too racy for U.S. audiences and were cut before being shown. Sometimes unacceptable words were dubbed out on the soundtrack.

In other cases, manifestations were created for different regions. Newsreels were issued in several manifestations with regional stories for showing only in a certain part of the country. Leni Riefenstahl made several different manifestations of *Olympia* (1936); the German manifestation included more minor events so as to show more German victories than did the Spanish and English manifestations.

TYPES OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MOVING IMAGE MANIFESTATIONS OR NEAR-EQUIVALENTS

Manifestations of moving-image works can be created in many of the same ways that manifestations of other kinds of work can be created. Let us consider some specific categories of difference.

DIFFERENCE IN TITLE AND ORDER OF CREDITS: TITLE MANIFESTATIONS

It is very common for films to be reissued or rereleased under new titles, and for television programs to be rebroadcast under new series titles. At least one reason for the reissue of films under new titles was a desire to prevent a member of the audience from realizing ahead of time that he or she had already seen the film. McElwee mentions, for example, that Chaplin and Pickford shorts were reissued under a variety of misleading titles (McElwee 1989, 593). Maltin indicates that films are being retitled on video "to lure unsuspecting renters" (Maltin 1989, viii).

Films would also be reissued or rereleased with the credits altered. McElwee indicates that after Alan Ladd, Marilyn Monroe, and Humphrey Bogart became big stars, earlier films in which they played minor roles were reissued or rereleased with their names given top billing above the title. He mentions one such Bogart film, *Midnight* (1934), which also

had its title changed, to *Call It Murder*. Another example is the 1936 film of *As You Like It*. When originally issued, Elisabeth Bergner received top billing. By the time the film was reissued several years later, her costar, Laurence Olivier, was a bigger star and was given top billing on reissue prints. Making two separate catalog records for the original release and the reissue documents this difference in billing order for film historians. Billing changes are interesting in their own right, and therefore probably worth recording in our catalogs; as McElwee puts it, "Billing changes charted a player's rise and fall from the original release of a feature to its reissue years later" (McElwee 1990, pt. 3, 140). However, billing changes do not always please the actors and actresses involved. A recent news item in the *Los Angeles Times* indicates that Kevin Costner is suing a video firm for using his name prominently in marketing and distributing the 1985 film *Chasing Dreams*, in which Costner had a minor role ("Costner sues video firm" 1990).

DIFFERENCE IN EDITION OR DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: TRUE MANIFESTATIONS AND NEAR-EQUIVALENTS

Educational and informational films will sometimes carry edition statements on revised and updated editions. Until recently, such statements have been very rare on theatrically released films or network broadcast television programs. *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* (1977) had a much-advertised rerelease in 1980 as "The Special Edition," which had indeed been re-edited by Spielberg. The recently released reconstructed manifestations of films such as *A Star is Born* (1954) and *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962) have had prominently displayed manifestation statements, as have the director's cut manifestations being released on video. Television manifestations and airline manifestations, on the other hand, do not carry explicit manifestation statements, and the industry has resisted recent attempts to get it to label such manifestations.

Distribution statements often differ on moving-image materials without there being any other difference. In today's world of videocassette distribution, one suspects that rights to videocassette distribution frequently change hands without any accompanying change in the work being distributed. This was undoubtedly true, as well, in the 16 millimeter market that preceded today's videocassette market.

DIFFERENCE IN ACTUAL CONTENT: TRUE MANIFESTATIONS

There are basically three ways in which an edited film work can be altered in such a way as to create differences in the intellectual and artistic content significant enough to create a new manifestation of the work.

- The film can be edited to change the continuity. For example, footage can be deleted, or "cut," but with the original continuity, or order of shots, preserved. This would be equivalent to abridgement of textual works. Also, footage can be added, but with the original continuity preserved. This would be equivalent to enlargement of textual works. Finally, alternate footage can be substituted. The most common example of this is a manifestation released with two different endings.
- New material can be appended to the work. For example, Blackhawk reissues of early motion pictures often include historical introductions.
- Finally, changes to the soundtrack, or subtitles can be carried out by identifiable subsidiary authors, or the cast can change slightly. The soundtrack or titles can be either translated or rewritten entirely. (The term *titles* is used in the film world to mean either subtitles on sound films, or intertitles—frames of textual matter appearing between frames of picture—on silent films.) Differences in the soundtrack other than differences in text can occur. A silent film can have a music track added or changed, or the sound effects portion of the soundtrack can be changed. A commentary

by a film scholar can be added in such a way that it can be switched on or off. This latter would be equivalent to an edition of a textual work with commentary.

Some physical format differences, such as colorization or panning and scanning of wide-screen films, might be considered by some to be a difference in the intellectual and artistic content, because they affect the visuals so radically. These issues will be discussed further below.

The following, then, are examples of alteration that can be said to create new manifestations:

Manifestations with Editing Causing Differences in the Continuity or Track

This category includes short manifestations, and manifestations censored or edited for television or airline showing or for inclusion in double features. Informational films with new footage added to update them would fall into this category. Sometimes footage is added to films. Dobi indicates that the 1948 reissue of *Nanook of the North* (1922) included outtakes from the original footage that were not in the original release (Dobi 1977, 11). Airline and television manifestations might sometimes require the addition of footage to bring them up to contractual length or to fit specified time slots. MCA added a two-minute dream sequence to *Rear Window* (1954) after Hitchcock had died in order to make the film fit into television time slots. The rerelease of *Phantom of the Opera* (1925) in a sound manifestation required the shooting of new footage to replace silent footage where there were sound synchronization problems. In the course of restoring *Toll of the Sea* (1922), UCLA found it necessary to reshoot the last scene (Slide 1992, 109–10). Films released in several different manifestations fall into this category, as well. One example is Fred Niblo's *Blood and Sand* (1941), released with two different endings (American Film Institute 1971, 69). Another example is *Legal Eagles* (1986), which had its ending completely changed for television showings (Maltin 1989, viii). Several recent restoration projects, *A Star*

is Born (1954), *Intolerance* (1916), and *Way Down East* (1920), involved the substitution of stills for footage missing even after exhaustive searching (Everson 1990, 17; Gunning 1984, 19; Haver 1983, 33; Stanbrook 1989–90, 29).

Sound films can have their soundtracks altered in ways that do not involve differences in the footage. The MCA Home Video videocassette and videodisc manifestations of *Dracula* (1931) include an original soundtrack suppressed before release because it contained more groans, bone cracks and other horrible noises than were considered acceptable for audiences of the 1930s.

Addition of New Material Appended to Work

Some of the new director's cuts being released on video include such additions as an interview with the director, outtakes, rehearsals, shot setups, and auditions (Fleming 1990). Blackhawk reissues with historical introductions were mentioned above. McElwee mentions several silent films that were rereleased in the sound era with prologues (McElwee 1989, 594). He also mentions that *Public Enemy* (1931) was rereleased in 1954, heavily censored and with a cautionary foreword (McElwee 1989, 596).

Rebroadcasts of television programs might be considered to be special cases in this category. When television programs are rebroadcast, the commercials, public service and station announcements, etc., that are broadcast at regular intervals throughout the program are different. Since commercials and the like can be very revealing social and historical documents in their own right, they are often analyzed in contents notes and made accessible by means of analytical title added entries in television cataloging. Thus, it is useful to treat each rebroadcast of a television program as a new manifestation and create a new record for it.

Manifestations with Subsidiary Authors

This category includes dubbed and subtitled manifestations in which the soundtrack in one language has been translated

into another language. It also includes silent films with intertitles that have been translated from another language. The intertitles on silent films can differ from one manifestation to another in ways other than translation. For example, Gunning indicates that *Way Down East* (1920), Griffith's silent film, existed in manifestations with several different sets of intertitles (Gunning 1984). Gillett notes that "intertitles could be altered to smooth over censorship problems from one country to another" (Gillett 1977–78, 38). There have been several English translations of soundtrack into subtitles for *Grand Illusion* (1937) and *Breathless* (1960), some more accurate than others. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, during the transition from silent to sound films, films were often released in silent and sound manifestations. The sound manifestations would have music tracks and some dialogue added. The new FIAF rules consider difference in language, music, or dialogue to create "an item with minor changes," one that is to be described on the same record as the item without such differences (FIAF 1991, 41). Since such "minor" differences can be associated with differences in subsidiary authorship (translator, composer, writer of intertitles, etc.), this practice seems dangerous. It could lead to no access under the names of subsidiary authors, or to misleading access if a user retrieves a record on which only one holding of several is of interest; it might be hard for the user to tell which holding is of interest when a great deal of holding-specific information is buried far down the record in the notes. Another consideration is that the coding for language in the USMARC format is record-specific. If holdings have different language characteristics, there is no way at present to code for them all.

In addition to the voices of the performers, the soundtrack of a film also contains music and sound effects, and these, too, can be different from one manifestation to another. Films originally issued silent can be reissued or rereleased with a music track. The same film can be reissued or rereleased with several different music tracks. Few of the silent films came

with a score, but some did. Various manifestations of these silent films can exist with various performances of the same original score. Stanbrook discusses a new recording of the original score for *Alexander Nevsky* (1938), for instance, and mentions a video manifestation of *Battleship Potemkin* (1925) that allows one to choose to hear either the score originally composed for the film by Edmund Meisel, or the score by N. Kryukov that was associated with the film for years (Stanbrook 1989–90, 31). The restorations of *Nanook of the North* (1922), and *Lucky Star* (1929) include newly composed contemporary scores on the soundtracks (Dobi 1977, 14–16; Benson 1991). On the 1942 reissue of *Gold Rush* (1925), Chaplin's voice was substituted for the original intertitles (McElwee 1989, 594). The thrust of *North Star* (1943) was completely changed on rerelease as *Armoured Attack*, largely by editing the soundtrack. The reconstruction of the director's cut of *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962) involved getting some of the original actors to rerecord eight minutes of their dialogue, which was then mechanically altered to compensate for the way the actors' voices would have changed over the years (Stanbrook 1989–90, 31). *Fantasia* (1940) was apparently released in 1982 with a new performance of the musical track conducted by Irwin Kostal, replacing Leopold Stokowski's original performance (Phinn 1990, 86).

PHYSICAL VARIANTS: NEAR-EQUIVALENTS

Sometimes rather substantive changes take place in physical format. For example, color films can be reissued as black and white, black-and-white films can be colorized, and silent films can be reissued with music and effects tracks. Such differences can substantially affect the quality of image in what are essentially visual materials. The addition of soundtrack to a silent film actually introduces an element of subsidiary authorship (e.g., the arranger of a music track), and a colorizer might also be considered a subsidiary author. For these reasons, such differ-

ences might be said to create a new manifestation on the grounds of difference in intellectual and artistic content. Haserot would seem to support this approach when she writes, "The addition of color . . . radically alters the film's nature by changing the language through which a film communicates" (Haserot 1989, 50). However, this argument might also be used to argue that the creation of a black-and-white print of a film originally in color, frequently done in the days when television was black and white, creates a new manifestation, or that two black-and-white prints of a silent film, one with tinting, are two different manifestations. Videotransfer of a color film alters its color values and preservation of a Technicolor film must be done on Eastmancolor stock using a completely different color process, because the earlier color process is no longer available in the United States. Certainly these bits of information about the prints are important and should be communicated to users, but whether a new record is necessary to do so is another question.

Other substantive differences in physical format could result in near-equivalents, as well, if they could be concisely indicated in the physical description. Ever since the 1950s, the motion picture industry has been trying to devise means to make films spectacular enough to draw the audience away from their television sets and back to the theaters. Various wide-screen processes, 3D, and various kinds of stereo sound have been the result. Usually these processes required that the films be projected using special equipment that not all theaters would have. Thus, the films were often issued in several different formats. Three-dimensional films were often released in both a 3D manifestation and a non-3D manifestation for running in theaters that did not have the correct projection equipment to show 3D films. The same is true of wide-screen films and, more recently, films on 70 millimeter film that would also be issued in 35 millimeter for theaters that could not project 70 millimeter. All of these could easily be treated as near-equivalents. In the days of the transition

to sound, prints would be released with both optical soundtracks and sound-on-sound recording disks for the smaller theaters that had not yet converted to the newer sound equipment. Other examples of physical variants eligible for this treatment might be monophonic and stereo soundtrack variants, or panned-and-scanned 16 millimeter prints or videocassettes of wide-screen motion pictures in which a wide-screen image has been cropped at the sides, losing part of the picture, or even cut slightly differently. (A wide-screen sequence of two people having a conversation, with both people on screen, and with no cuts, can become a sequence in which one person is shown on screen at a time, with cuts at each point where one person stops talking and the other begins. Apparently panning and scanning is also occasionally used to make a wide-screen film out of one originally released at the standard width. The 50th anniversary reissue of *Snow White* (1937) in 1987 was "vertically panned and scanned to fit the 1.85 frame," according to Joseph McBride [McBride 1992].) Letterboxing, adding black borders to the top and bottom of a wide-screen image to allow it all to fit into the bounds of a CRT screen, actually preserves the original wide-screen image, so although the fact that letterboxing has been done should be recorded as holding-specific information, it cannot be argued that it creates a new manifestation per se. It can certainly be argued that these differences represent a significant difference in the intellectual or artistic content. However, if this kind of difference is the only difference between two items, and the difference can be clearly indicated in the physical description, a more economical way to communicate the difference might be to make one record for both items, with repeated physical descriptions, rather than creating two full bibliographic records that differ only in the physical description.

The equivalent for soundtracks of colorization is "stereo-ization." Spotnitz writes about sound engineer Rick Chace, who since 1984 "has electronically transfigured the soundtracks of some 300 films—including *Casablanca*, *Gone With*

the Wind, and *Bambi*—eliminating unwanted noise and converting monophonic, or single-channel, sound into stereo" (Spotnitz 1990, 56). McElwee also mentions the Perspecta Process, which simulated stereo and was applied to reissues of *Gone With the Wind* (1939) and *The Jolson Story* (1946), and a reissue of Disney's *Fantasia* (1940) with a Dolby track that apparently annoyed Disneyphiles (McElwee 1990, pt. 3, 139). Certainly these differences should be communicated to users so that they can make sure they have the proper equipment or can simply make choices, but whether they need to be treated as distinct manifestations is questionable. Spotnitz quotes several people who differ in their views about the advisability of tampering with original soundtracks in this way, but ends with a quote from director John Milius, who says, "As long as it sounds basically the same, it doesn't matter" (Spotnitz 1990, 56).

Restoration of earlier film formats, such as 22 millimeter, 17.5 millimeter and 28 millimeter, can involve blowing the image up to a standard 35 millimeter image. Silent films were shot through hand-cranked cameras and then projected through projectors that were hand-cranked by projectionists to match the original cameraman's speed. Thus film speed can vary a great deal. In order to restore silent films that are not at the modern 24-frames-per-second speed, the films are often step-printed (a process in which a single frame is repeated) up to 24 frames per second. Again, these kinds of differences seem to produce near-equivalents, rather than new manifestations.

More controversial changes to film speed apparently occur in the process of "time compression/expansion" of picture and "lexiconing" of sound in order to shorten or lengthen a film to fit broadcast formats. As Stanley Richards puts it, "The art of an actor's performance is bound up in timing. Every moment of principal photography is concerned with timing—of staging, of performance, of camera movement. Filmmakers labor in postproduction for months and even years to finesse the exact timing of cuts and pacing of

sequences to within a fraction of a second. Time compression/expansion (literally running the film in slow or speeded-up motion) is so totally damaging to every single moment of the filmmaker's vision that to allow for its use . . . is an insult to intelligent thinking men and women everywhere" (Richards 1990). If time compression/expansion and lexiconing result in any loss of image or soundtrack, they certainly should be considered to create a new manifestation; if not, however, perhaps they could be considered to create near-equivalents.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING MOVING-IMAGE MATERIALS

It appears, from anecdotal evidence in the literature, that the following kinds of difference can occur between film items representing the same work:

- Title manifestations can occur when the title or billing order differs without there being any underlying difference in continuity.
- Distribution information can differ without there being any underlying difference in continuity, creating a near-equivalent.
- True manifestations can occur when the continuity, i.e., visual aspect of the work, or the soundtrack, i.e., audio aspect of the work, or the textual aspect of the work actually differ, whether due to editing, due to the appending of new material or due to the work of subsidiary authors creating subtitles, new music tracks, etc.
- Finally, physical variants or near-equivalents can occur when physical format differs without the involvement of subsidiary authors.

SHOULD THE OBJECT OF THE RECORD BE CODIFIED?

There is a long history of variant practice with regard to the object of a record, i.e., different institutions have different policies on when one item is sufficiently different from another to require a new record. It is one area in which cataloging institutions are still free to follow local

practice based on local needs. To the degree that there are emerging standards, they conflict. For example, OCLC's input standards are quite different from the LCRI on when to make a new record. Current library practice calls for making two full catalog records for two items that differ only in distributor or physical format. On the other hand, current archival moving-image practice calls for recording on the same record two items that have significantly different intellectual and artistic content, such as two films that are in different languages or have different music tracks.

Since the time of Jewett, catalog codes have avoided formulating rules concerning the object of a record. Some might argue that it is a healthy thing to allow local practice to vary. Public librarians could probably make the case that the majority of their users are not particular as to which edition (setting of type) they read, and that the long practice in public libraries of making one record for each text is adequate for their users. On the other hand, it is possible that research libraries, with their current financial problems and cataloging backlogs, should consider adopting practices similar to these for purposes of economy. The Multiple Versions Forum might represent a slight trend in this direction, although the field has taken a conservative approach in limiting application to reproductions. If all institutions were to decide to create new records only when significant difference in either intellectual and artistic content or identification occurs, codification of this practice would help to standardize it. Now that many of us are using large bibliographic databases such as OCLC for shared cataloging and interlibrary loan, such standardization could have a practical benefit for copy catalogers and interlibrary loan clerks and those patrons who benefit from their activities if the standardization could be done in a simple, elegant, and principled way that could be explained to copy catalogers and interlibrary loan clerks. If codification of the object of a record is attempted, however, it should be based on a rationale of empirical research.

WORKS CITED

Note: The following abbreviations have been used in the citations for this paper:

ALA American Library Association
LC Library of Congress

- American Film Institute. 1971. *The American Film Institute catalog of motion pictures produced in the United States. Feature films, 1921-1930* New York: Bowker.
- American Library Association. 1908. *Catalog rules: Author and title entries*. American ed. Boston, Mass.: American Library Assn., Publishing Board.
- . 1967. *Anglo-American cataloging rules*. North American text. Chicago: American Library Assn.
- . 1941. Catalog Code Revision Committee. *A.L.A. catalog rules: Author and title entries, prelim.* American 2d ed. Chicago: American Library Assn.
- . 1974. *Anglo-American cataloging rules*. North American text. Chapter 6, separately published monographs. Chicago: American Library Assn.
- . 1988. *Anglo-American cataloging rules*. 2d ed. 1988 revision. Chicago: American Library Assn.
- . Association for Library Collections & Technical Services. Cataloging Committee: Description and Access. Task Force on Multiple Versions. 1992. *Guidelines for bibliographic description of reproductions*. May 17, 1992 draft prepared by the Cataloging Committee: Description and Access Task Force on Multiple Versions, and adopted in June 1992.
- Attig, John. 1989. Descriptive cataloging rules and machine-readable record structures: Some directions for parallel development. In *The conceptual foundations of descriptive cataloging*, ed. Elaine Svenonius. San Diego: Academic Press: 135-48.
- Benson, Sheila. 1991. A glowing lucky star rises again. *Los Angeles times*, Nov. 5.
- Blanck, Jacob. 1966. *The title-page as bibliographical evidence* Berkeley, Calif.: School of Librarianship, University of California.
- Costner sues video firm. 1990. *Los Angeles times*, Feb. 7.
- Coyle, Karen. 1984. Consolidation of monograph records in the UC online catalog. *DLA bulletin* 4.2: 10-13.
- . 1985. Record matching: A discussion. *Information technology and libraries* 4: 57-59.
- Coyle, Karen, and Linda Gallaher-Brown. 1985. Record matching: An expert algo-

rithm. In: *ASIS '85*, ed. Carol A. Parkhurst. White Plains, N.Y.: Published for the American Society for Information Science by Knowledge Industry Pubs., 77-80.

- Cutter, Charles A. 1876. Rules for a printed dictionary catalogue. In *Public libraries in the United States of America: Their history, condition and management: Special report, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. Part II*. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 3-89.
- . 1904. *Rules for a dictionary catalog*. 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off.
- Dobi, Steve. 1977. Restoring Robert Flaherty's *Nanook of the north*. *Film library quarterly* 10, nos. 1 and 2: 11.
- Domanovszky, A. 1974. *Functions and objects of author and title cataloguing* Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.
- Du Rietz, Rolf. 1974. The concept of bibliotype. *Text* 1: 78-92.
- Everson, William K. 1990. *Intolerance*. *Films in review* 41, nos. 1/2 (Jan./Feb.): 1-20.
- Fellows, Dorcas. 1915. Cataloging rules, prelim. ed. *University of the State of New York bulletin* 586 (Mar. 1): 7-175.
- FIAF. 1991. *The FIAF Cataloging rules for film archives*, comp. and ed. Harriet W. Harrison for the FIAF Cataloguing Commission. Munich: K.G. Saur.
- Fleming, Charles. 1990. Directors' [sic] cut. *American film* 15, no. 6 (Mar. 11).
- Fothergill, Richard, and Ian Butchart. *Non-book materials in libraries: A practical guide*. Hamden, Conn.: Linnett, 1978.
- Gaskell, Philip. 1972. *A new introduction to bibliography*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr.
- Gillett, John. 1977. Munich's cleaned pictures. *Sight and sound* 47, no. 1 (Winter): 37-39.
- Gunning, Tom. 1984. Rebirth of a movie. *American film* 10, no. 1 (Oct. 18-19): 93.
- Hagler, Ronald. 1963. Local autonomy. *Library resources & technical services* 7: 340-49.
- Haserot, Karen E. 1989. The colorization of film: Technical, legal, historical, and sociocultural considerations. *Techné* 3 (Spring) 45-52.
- Haver, Ronald. 1983. A Star is born again. *American film* 8, no. 9: 29-33, 59.
- Hickey, Thomas B., and David J. Rypka. 1979. Automatic detection of duplicate monographic records. *Journal of library automation* 12: 125-42.
- Hinnebusch, Mark. 1989. METAMARC: An extension of the MARC format. *Information technology and libraries* 8: 20-33.

- IFLA Committee on Cataloguing. 1974. *ISBDM: International standard bibliographic description for monographic publications*, 1st standard ed. London: IFLA Committee on Cataloguing.
- IFLA International Office for UBC. 1977. *ISBD(G): General international standard bibliographic description: Annotated text*. London: IFLA International Office for UBC.
- IFLA Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme. 1987. *ISBD(M): International standard bibliographic description for monographic publications*. Rev. ed. London: IFLA Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme, British Library Bibliographic Services.
- Jewett, Charles Coffin. 1852. Rules for preparing catalog cards. In *Smithsonian report on the construction of catalogues of libraries and of a general catalogue; and their publication by means of separate stereotyped titles with rules and examples*. Washington, D.C. Mimeographed typescript transcription, Univ. of Michigan, Dept. of Library Science. Course 305. n.d.
- . 1853. On the construction of catalogues. 2d ed. In *Charles Coffin Jewett and American librarianship, 1841-1968*, ed. Michael H. Harris. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited. 1975: 131-55.
- Jolley, L. 1961. *The principles of cataloguing*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Klemperer, Katharine. 1978. *Bibliographic specifications for consolidation of records*. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of Calif. Division of Library Automation.
- Layne, Sara Shatford. 1989. Integration and Objectives of the Catalog. In *The Conceptual Foundations of Descriptive Cataloguing*, ed. Elaine Svenonius. San Diego: Academic Press, 185-96.
- Library of Congress. 1981. 1.0. *Cataloging service bulletin* 11: 3.
- . 1990. Edition or copy. *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 49: 10.
- Library of Congress. Descriptive Cataloging Division. 1949. *Rules for descriptive cataloging in the Library of Congress* Washington, D.C.: LC, DCD.
- Library of Congress. Processing Dept. 1946. *Studies of Descriptive Cataloging: a Report to the Librarian of Congress by the Director of the Processing Dept.* Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off.
- MacLaury, Keith D. 1979. Automatic merging of monographic data bases—use of fixed-length keys derived from title strings. *Journal of library automation* 12: 143-55.
- Maltin, Leonard. 1989. *Leonard Maltin's TV movies and video guide*. 1990 ed. Bergenfield, N.J.: New American Library, 1989.
- McBride, Joseph. 1992. New technique brings Pinocchio back to life. *Daily variety*, June 11, 35.
- McElwee, John P. 1989. Theatrical re-issues. *Films in review* 40: 593-96.
- . 1990. Theatrical re-issues, Part 3. *Films in review* 41: 139-45.
- McNellis, Claudia Houk. 1985. Describing re-productions: Multiple physical manifestations in the bibliographical universe. *Cataloging & classification quarterly* 5: 35-48.
- McPherson, Dorothy S., Karen E. Coyle, and Teresa L. Montgomery. 1982. Building a merged bibliographic database: The University of California experience. *Information technology and libraries* 1: 371-80.
- Multiple Versions Forum. 1990. *Multiple Versions Forum report: Report from a meeting held December, 1989, Airlie, Virginia*. Washington, D.C.: Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress.
- OCLC. 1993. *Bibliographic formats and standards*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC.
- O'Neill, Edward T. 1990. Duplicate Detection. *Annual review of OCLC research* 1989-1990: 13-14.
- . 1991. Duplicate Records in Union Catalogs. *Annual Review of OCLC Research* 1990-1991: 11-14.
- O'Neill, Edward T., Sally A. Rogers, and W. Michael Oskins. 1993. Characteristics of duplicate records in OCLC's online union catalog. *Library resources & technical services* 37: 59-72.
- Panizzi, Antonio. 1855. Rules for the compilation of the catalogue. In *Foundations of cataloging: A sourcebook*, ed. Michael Carpenter and Elaine Svenonius. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1-14.
- Phinn, Kevin. 1990. Shot by shot [column]. Disney restores *Fantasia*, its most ambitious feature. *Premiere*, Nov., 84-89.
- Ravilious, C. P. 1975. Analysis and evaluation of existing cataloguing codes. In *A survey of existing systems and current proposals for the cataloguing and description of non-book materials collected by libraries, with preliminary suggestions for their international coordination*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Richards, Stanley. 1990. New definitions of preservation. *Daily variety*, Aug. 31, 12.
- Richmond, Phyllis A. 1980. AACR2—a review article. *The journal of academic librarianship* 6: 30-37.
- Shinebourne, John A. 1979. A Critique of AACR. *Libri* 29: 231-59.
- Slide, Anthony. 1992. *Nitrate won't wait*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.
- Spottnitz, Frank. 1990. The Sound of Two Hands Clapping. *American Film* 15, no. 9: 56-57.
- Stanbrook, Alan. 1989/90. As it was in the beginning. *Sight and sound* 59, no. 1: 28-32.
- Steinberg, S. H. 1974. *Five hundred years of printing*. 3d ed. New York: Penguin.
- Svenonius, Elaine, and Edward T. O'Neill. 1988. Clustering equivalent bibliographic records. *Annual review of OCLC research*, 1987-1988, 6-8.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. 1975. The bibliographical concepts of issue and state. *Bibliographical society of America. Papers* 69: 17-65.
- Thaxter, Dick, quoted in Verna Urbanski. 1983. Clinic on AV editions held during ALA. *Newsletter* (On-line audiovisual catalogers) 3.3 19-20.
- Tillett, Barbara B. 1987. *Bibliographic relationships: Toward a conceptual structure of bibliographic information used in cataloging*. Ph.D. diss., UCLA.
- Todd, William B. 1981. Scholarly uses of the national union catalog: A bibliographic saga. In *In Celebration: the National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints*, ed. John Y. Cole. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 48.
- Tucker, Ben. Letter to Martha Yee, Oct. 13, 1982.
- Wanninger, Patricia Dwyer. 1982. Is the OCLC database too large? A study of the effect of duplicate records in the OCLC system. *Library resources & technical services* 26: 353-61.
- Whiting, A. D. 1980. AACR2—edition statement. *Catalogue & index* 59: 5-6.
- Williams, Martha E., and Keith D. MacLaury. 1979. Automatic merging of monographic data bases—Identification of duplicate records in multiple files: The IUCS scheme. *Journal of library automation* 12: 156-68.
- Wilson, Patrick. 1989. The objectives of the catalog and the means to reach them. In *The conceptual foundations of descriptive cataloging*, ed. Elaine Svenonius. San Diego: Academic, 1-16.
- Yee, Martha M. 1991. System design and cataloging meet the user: User interfaces to online public access catalogs. *Journal of the American society for information science* 42: 78-98.
- . 1993. Moving image works and manifestations. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.