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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 physical form of a work. A near-equivalent may be considered significant by a general user if it is not easily identifiable as such from its cover or label. A manifestation of a work may be considered significant by a general user if it is not easily identifiable as such from its cover or label. A manifestation of a work may be considered significant by a general user if it contains a significant difference in the continuity of the work, 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.
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 of books, might find the practice of examining the history of a work, or the preservation officer, who might be interested in binding or paper of differing qualities, beneficial. Indeed, a thorough, critical reading 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; Lin (1989, 923-93)) have proposed different job-based records. Hinnbusch (1989) has proposed devising hierarchical MARC records; Attig (1980) has discussed the difficulty of linking MARC unit records; and Yee (1991, 81) has discussed the possible value of matching keyword-in-user-known formats to make comparisons against the set of records that make up a work.

A good deal of what follows will concern 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 records, which can cause the item being cataloged to be considered a reproduction, 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**

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. Jewel’s rule IV reads in part, “The whole title is to be repeated, for every distinct issue, independently, in the case of title pages and preliminaries, to determine when two items were different editions of the same work.”

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 editions: “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)” (Cutler 1904, 19). The 1908 rules were the first Anglo-American cataloging rules to provide a definition of edition: “The whole number of copies printed from the same set of types 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, 5).

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 images, and that in fact they have relied on evidence of changes or differences in pagination 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 practice of preparing catalog entries for 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 catalog as copies if the description of the first one cataloged fits those received later in all material, but at the same time 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 distinguishing 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 catalog record: “The objectives of descriptive cataloging are (1) to state the significant features of an item, and (2) to avoid 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(C) 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 (IPLA International Library Preparations Committee 1977). 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 result in pooling away from legislation in the cataloging code itself on what the object of a single description should be. Because of the reality of Congress and the OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., have published fairly elaborate guidelines, which differ from each other, to 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. This will be considered in more detail in the next section.
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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 Cataloging 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 bibliographic sense 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 for making separate records is to cover differences in series titles. 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, 10).

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 that 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 hook, call every thousand copies of it a separate edition, and, for twenty or more editions, there may be no alteration 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 imprint 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 Longman, Hurst, & Co in 1806. The identical pagination, the only differences being publication dates of 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907. One can be 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 to be described on the same record if the only difference between them was in publication date and 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 separate records (LC 1990, 10). OCLC allows the cataloger to ignore variation in fuller’s name of publisher (OCLC 1993, 45), although its machine matching algorithm probably would not do so (O’Neill 1990, 10).

Beginning in the 19th century, the use of stereotype plates and electroplates for printing made it possible for the same edition to contain differences and near-equivalents that are likely to bring up larger numbers of records than if these near-equivalents were ignored. The date of publication element, indicating publication dates of 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907. One can be 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 to be described on the same record if the only difference between them was in publication date and 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 separate records (LC 1990, 10). OCLC allows the cataloger to ignore variation in fuller’s name of publisher (OCLC 1993, 45), although its machine matching algorithm probably would not do so (O’Neill 1990, 10).

Beginning in the 19th century, the use of stereotype plates and electroplates for printing made it possible for the same edition to contain differences and near-equivalents that are likely to bring up larger numbers of records than if these near-equivalents were ignored. The date of publication element, indicating publication dates of 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907. One can be certain that these are all the same edition, but different issues with different dates, in order to indicate continuing availability.
manifestation at any given point in time. Some sources such as Books in Print contain 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 in distributor and subsequent records were recorded as near-equivalent-specific variations, so that they could be assured they 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 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."

"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." (Tillett 1987, 43). However, she includes editions in this sense of reissuing or abridging, or otherwise modifies the entire text or portions of it" (Tillett 1987, 43). Thus, several writers have suggested that a conceptual level between work and manifestation is needed, perhaps to be called version (Donnemeyer 1974, 102; Du Bietz 1974, 84; Richmond 1980, 33; Shirinbourne 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.

**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 circumstances in which a copy of an original has been treated as a new work rather than as a manifestation. The few examples here will deal with the differences in subsidiary authorship, which have been discussed above. A descriptive relationship holds between a bibliographic item and another, when the purpose is to describe, or other similar entries in the catalogs.

Information Service. Other times manifestations, dashed-on entries, or other similar entries in the catalogs or bibliographies, can be due to reproduction or simultaneous release of an item, in order to reach different markets. Examples would be a microform of a text, CD and audiocassette releases of a motion picture, a videocassette copy of a motion picture, a compact disc copy of a motion picture, and a video cassette copy of a motion picture. Sometimes reproductions are made for preservation or conservation 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 surro-
An unresolved difficulty with a hierarchically structured record is that of deciding how to describe primarily when the item reproduced is not in hand, or when no one item has primary, 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. 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.

**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 of large bibliographic databases that collect records from many different sources (Coyne 1984; Coyne 1985; Coyne and Gal- lagher 1978; Williams and Maury 1979). The function of a record-matching algorithm is to identify duplicate records, records that represent the same intellectual or artistic content. There is some evidence that these are being designed to try to deal with near-equivalences, for example, most match only on certain characters in the title field, not all characters (Coyne 1985, 50). 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-equivalences 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 precision of .53, if the record similarity is set to .9 (O'Neill 1900, 13-14); in other words, 93% of the identified pairs were duplicates, and presum­ably the proportion still holds true for the 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 items. 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-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 may not be tolerable in a high-quality database. The major value of the study lies in the intellectual analysis of the types of differences between items that are known to the cataloger, and the way they are communicated in catalog records under current practice.

The study that revealed that of these 49 groups, 40 consisted of either imprints, reprints, type-fac­similes or copies, rather than true editions or reprints (Coyne, Lawrence, and Byrka 1979). The study also noted that there were a number of cases in which paging was a more reliable clue than title page; e.g., the O'Neill study noted that seven percent 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 matched and 13% of pairs falsely were not matched, and might not be tolerable in a high-quality database.

**PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON VISIBLE INDICATORS OF MANIFESTATIONS**

In 1946, the Library of Congress published a study 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; it was considered valuable in its own right, 70% 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 matched and 13% of pairs falsely were not matched, and might not be tolerable in a high-quality database.
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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 may not be tolerable in a high-quality database. The major value of the study lies in the intellectual analysis of the types of differences between items that are known to the cataloger, and the way they are communicated in catalog records under current practice.
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manifestation of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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 of a work. Differences are
indicated to users by the fact that two
records are identical except at the points
where the differences between the various
manifestations of a work are being described. A record
is made for every different reproduction, or that differ in distribution
information. See figure 1 for some examples of cataloging done using this tech-
nique. 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
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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 threetiered 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-equivalents.

The current implementation of the two- or three-tiered hierarchical technique proposes that, if no near-equivalents be designated as the original, to be described in the bibliographic record itself. If it is conceived of as a five-tiered technique, the four tiers would be work—manifestation—near-equivalent—holding. If it is conceived of as a four-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 work, or with language or subsidiary variant 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 manifested 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 the manifestations held described in four or five tiers, would be able to see the 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 Version Form, therefore, would represent a move in the direction of the four- or five-tiered hierarchical technique, although not 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 the 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 2 for an example taken from the Television Archive, where no attempt is made to identify an original.

4. Video reproduction of a 35 mm film (fict.) indicates portions of record here omitted for the sake of brevity.


6 film reels (103 min.) : sd., col. ; 35 mm.

Author, James Warner Bellah.


Credits: Art director, James Basevi; musical director, C. Bakailekoff; photography, Winston 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.

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 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 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-level cataloging hierarchy is impractical, the following discussion of recommended cataloging techniques assumes a choice between the separate record technique.
SMOLLET (TOBIAS GEORGE)

AN ESSAY ON THE EXTERNAL USE OF WATER.
—— An essay on the external use of water. In a letter to Dr. [illegible] 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, 1782. C. 123. k. 3. pp. 48. 4°.


THE EXPEDITION OF HUMPHRY CLINKER

Anonymous.

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

Anonymous.


Anonymous.

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.

Anonymous.

Δ


Δ Anonymous.

Anonymous.

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

Anonymous.
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 insignificant 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, 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 different 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 (paying 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 are considerable and are caused by, among other things, different types of reproduction, 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 release years later" (McElwee 1990, pt. 3, 140). However, billing changes do not always please the actors and actresses involved in the film. In which Costner had a minor role ("Costner

**TYPES OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MOVING IMAGE MANIFESTATIONS OR NEAR-EQUIVALENTS**

Manifetation: of moving-image works can be created for censorship reasons. In the early days of states' rights distribution of moving-image works, 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 release years later" (McElwee 1990, pt. 3, 140). However, billing changes do not always please the actors and actresses involved in the film. In which Costner had a minor role ("Costner

**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 title and order of credits to be renumbered or reordered. The example of the 1929 film It, which Costner had a minor role ("Costner

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

Educational and informational films will sometimes carry edition statements on reissued and updated editions. 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 newly 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 attempts to get it to label such manifestations.
Finally, changes to the soundtrack, or 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 titles-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 differences 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 Soundtrack or Track

This category includes short manifestations, and manifestations censored or edited for television or airline showings or for inclusion in double features. Informal films with new footage added to update them would fall into this category. Sometimes footage is added to films. Don't indicates that the 1948 release of Nanook of the North (1922) included outtakes from the original footage that were not in the original release. Airline and television manifestations might sometimes require the addition of dialogue, music, or sound effects. It could lead to a variation in a holding-specific information and to a different format. MCA Home Video added music tracks. The same film can be released with two different music tracks. The film can be altered in ways that do not involve differences 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 release (i.e., one or more silent films were released in the sound era as dubbed and subtitled manifestations to bring them up to contractual length or to correct synchronization problems. In the mss, the soundtrack of a film also contained additional dialogue, music tracks, and other aspects of television programs.

Addition of New Material

Appended to Work or Manifestation

Some of the new director's cuts being released on video include such additions as sound manifestations. The soundtrack of a film also contains additional dialogue, music tracks, and other aspects of television programs.

Distribution statements often differ on moving-image materials without there being any other difference. In today's world of videocassette distribution, one suspects that the 1895 silent film Scientific American would frequently change hands without any accompanying change in the work being distributed. This was undoubtedly true, as well, in the 186-meter market that preceded today's videocassette market.
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 whether to be shown 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 1990-99, 31). The restorations of Nanook of the North (1922), and Lucky Star (1923) included newly composed contemporaneous soundtracks on the LP format (Dobi 1977, 14-16; Benson 1991). On the 1942 reissue of Gold Rush (1925), Chaplin's voice was replaced by that of the original voiceover announcer for the silent film, and the original intertitle typescripts were also replaced by typescripts for the speaking roles (McElwee 1989, 594). The thrust of North Star (1943) was completely changed on reissue as Armoured Attack, largely by altering the soundtrack. The reconstruction of the director's cut of Laurence of Arabia (1962) involved getting some, if not all, of the original actors to rerecord eight minutes of their dialogue, which was then mechanically altered to compensate for the way the actors' voices had changed over the years (Stanbrook 1990-99, 31). Fantasia (1940) was apparently released in 1962 with several minutes of the original musical soundtrack conducted by Irving Kostal, replacing Leopold Stokowski's original performance (Flinn 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, and 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, color films can be reissued as black-and-white prints, and silent films can be reissued with a new performance of the musical track conducted by Leopold Stokowski's original performance, or even a score by Iflin Kostal, replacing N. Kryukov's that was associated with the film for years (Stanbrook 1989-90, 31). The restorations of Battleship Potemkin (1925) that allows one to choose whether to be shown 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 1990-99, 31). Fantasia (1940) was apparently released in 1962 with several minutes of the original musical soundtrack conducted by Irving Kostal, replacing Leopold Stokowski's original performance (Flinn 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, and 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, color films can be reissued as black-and-white prints, and silent films can be reissued with a new performance of the musical track conducted by Leopold Stokowski's original performance, or even a score by Iflin Kostal, replacing N. Kryukov's that was associated with the film for years (Stanbrook 1989-90, 31). The restorations of Battleship Potemkin (1925) that allows one to choose whether to be shown 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 1990-99, 31). Fantasia (1940) was apparently released in 1962 with several minutes of the original musical soundtrack conducted by Irving Kostal, replacing Leopold Stokowski's original performance (Flinn 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, and 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, color films can be reissued as black-and-white prints, and silent films can be reissued with a new performance of the musical track conducted by Leopold Stokowski's original performance, or even a score by Iflin Kostal, replacing N. Kryukov's that was associated with the film for years (Stanbrook 1989-90, 31). The restorations of Battleship Potemkin (1925) that allows one to choose whether to be shown 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 1990-99, 31). Fantasia (1940) was apparently released in 1962 with several minutes of the original musical soundtrack conducted by Irving Kostal, replacing Leopold Stokowski's original performance (Flinn 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, and 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, color films can be reissued as black-and-white prints, and silent films can be reissued with a new performance of the musical track conducted by Leopold Stokowski's original performance, or even a score by Iflin Kostal, replacing N. Kryukov's that was associated with the film for years (Stanbrook 1989-90, 31). The restorations of Battleship Potemkin (1925) that allows one to choose whether to be shown 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 1990-99, 31). Fantasia (1940) was apparently released in 1962 with several minutes of the original musical soundtrack conducted by Irving Kostal, replacing Leopold Stokowski's original performance (Flinn 1990, 86).
sequences to within a fraction of a second. This 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 lesioning result in any loss of image or soundtrack, they certainly should be considered to create a new manifestation; if not, however, perhaps it should be considered to create near-equivalents.

**CONCLUSIONS REGARDING MOVING-IMAGE MATERIALS**

It appears, from anecdotal evidence in the literature, that the following kinds of differences can occur between film items representing the same work:
- Title manifestations can occur when subtitles, new music tracks, etc.
- Distribution information can differ
- True manifestations can occur when the time 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 CONSIDERED?**

There is a long history of variant practice with regard to the object of a record, i.e., different institutions have different policies on whether an 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, it is possible that research libraries, with their current financial problems and cataloging backlogs, should consider adopting practices similar to the Multiple Versions Forum, although cost may make that impossible. Public libraries, with their current financial problems and cataloging backlogs, should consider adopting practices similar to the Multiple Versions Forum, although cost may make that impossible. Public libraries, with their current financial problems and cataloging backlogs, should consider adopting practices similar to the Multiple Versions Forum, although cost may make that impossible.
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