

5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/1  
1 April 2005

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

**From:** Sally Strutt, Chair, JSC

**Subject:** AACR3 - Part I - Review by other rule makers of December 2004 Draft

These are comments on the draft Part I of AACR3 received from Elena Escolano Rodríguez on behalf of the Reglas de catalogación (Spain).

### Considerations on AACR3

- 1- Structure is really new. But it is going to suppose a big effort of adaptation for cataloguers, as to consult many chapters is always uncomfortable, and they are going to be forced to consult at least three in each description.
- 2- Terminology has changed and also definitions in glossary, with this it is being modified an established common field of understanding. For example it has changed the definition for Preliminaries at the same time Chief source of information, and prescribed sources.
- 3- Resources in multiple parts:  
We agree and think it is very interesting the change of chapter 12, on continuing resources, and the separation of integrating resources from serials. But what we do not agree with is that the same “multipart monograph” (as it still continues in glossary, and we accept) depending on its publishing simultaneously or in successive parts has different treatment. We recognize it is a kind of resource with a casuistry that needs special rules that we consider are not completely and well solved with the decision of joining the resource in successive parts with serials. Or if so, it should be more differentiated in A2. Also we think it is important at the time of description the character of “finite work” that has disappeared.  
Along all section A1 there are cross-reference to A2 for successive parts that are inconsistent, as in the respective rule of A2 only apply to serials.
- 4- About Information Sources- I like to see a joint explanation of source of information for all resources A1.0A1. And I like to see clearly expressed the order of preference as chief source in A1.0A2, but the paragraph preceding the order for all resources (“...prefer the source that provides the title proper as well as the most complete information relating to the title and statement of responsibility area, the edition area...”) is understandable for early books taking into account the change operated in the prescribed sources (out preliminaries and colophon), but the election is ambiguous and less accurate for modern resources that could vary depending on cataloguer criteria, and so the description, (for example in Serials not always the most complete information appear in the title page). This along with the last paragraph of this rule, in which the “chief source of information” now can be unitary or collective (title page and verso), has been changed the concept of title page, as verso has disappeared from preliminaries definition? So it is being changed traditionally accepted concepts.
- 5- A1.1B7 Titles in two of more forms: tell to choose the full form as the title proper, now extensible for all resources, and we think with this rule it is not being respected the general principle of representation (p.6).
- 6- We do not think Area 3 suits for multiple parts resources, as it is not much representative, it does not contribute relevant information, and it is not much useful. We only see it useful for multiple parts successive resources with not finite conclusion.
- 7- Area 4: it is true that S.I. S.n. do not contribute with much information, but it is a way to differentiate what it is published from what it is not, and sometimes we can have reprints of the same resource with or without publication information.
- 8- Area 5: We infer from examples, the extent of resources with pages always are going to be described in terms of number of volumes as units and specific material designation, and after it in parenthesis the number of pages, is it right?

If it is so the examples in A1.5B2 (p. A1-56) and in C7.5C13.1 (p. C7-4) are wrong. If not, those are the only examples in terms of pages, what is very strange and induce to error.

This is in general the main comments; also we have detected some misprints that I write following, in case it can be of help.

- In second example in p. A1-53, should not be comma instead of colon preceding the date?.
- In p. A1-55, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph after comma, should not be in present time “precede”?
- We do not understand well which is the intention of using mark of omission in the example in A1.6C1 (p. A1-73) and all the examples in p. A1-74, as in other areas when not transcribing some parts of statement it is not used.
- The first example in p. A1-84 is not clear, is it exemplifying A1.7B7 Other title information? Then, should not be “Subtitle” as in the second example? If not it refers and should be moved to A1.7B5 Variations in title.
- Misprint in third example in A1.7B30: interviewee should not be interviewer?
- In p. A2-1 Contents, mention to A2.1B8 is missing.
- In the title of A2.7B27 it should not appear iteration. “Issue, part, ~~or iteration~~ described”.
- In the title of A3.7B27 it should not appear issue, part: “~~Issue, part, or iteration~~ described”.
- In p. C1-1 Contents, mention to C1.5C3.2 Charts and flip charts is missing.

And finally two questions, if you do not mind:

Why it has disappeared the more general term electronic in return for digital in “digital resources”?, and

Where should be included the interactive resources?