

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: John Attig, ALA Representative  
Subject: Revision of RDA 2.5.2, Designation of Edition, and 2.5.6, Designation of a Named Revision of an Edition

ALA does not support this proposal, which we believe to be based on an understanding of the elements in question which differs from our understanding.

The element “Designation of a Named Revision of an Edition” has always been a difficult one to apply. The CC:DA Task Force on Consistency across Part I of AACR2 recognized the problems and attempted to make it clearer; however, the result was not particularly successful.

In its origin in the Anglo-American cataloguing tradition, this element derives from the ISBD. The element, its name, and its definition in RDA were derived from the text of AACR2, which was in turn derived from the ISBD as it existed when AACR2 was written. Since that time, in the preparation of the Consolidated Edition of the ISBD, there have been some changes to the ISBD text. In the latest version, the element is called “Additional Edition Statement” (ISBD 2.4) and the ISBD specification (2.4.1) reads:

An additional edition statement is given when the resource carries a formal statement identifying it as belonging to an edition or impression within an edition, or to an edition that is equivalent to the first edition, or when the resource has significant differences in content from other impressions of the larger edition to which it belongs.

This is still a bit unclear, but there seem to be two requirements for the existence of an “additional edition statement”:

1. The additional statement must appear **in addition to** the edition statement itself, and
2. It must identify **a subset of copies** of the edition.

A statement that appears on all copies of the edition is **not** an additional edition statement. If all copies of the “Troisième édition” say “revue et augmentée”, then the entire statement “Troisième édition, revue et augmentée” is the edition statement, and there is no additional edition statement.

While the examples which ACOC proposes to move from 2.5.2 to 2.5.6 might in fact apply to only a subset of copies, we have seen many examples that are almost identical to these in which the entire statement appears on all copies; there is no subset of copies of the named edition that contain a designation of a named revision that is not present on all copies. The intent of these additional statements is rather to differentiate this edition from

previous (presumably unrevised, uncorrected, un-augmented) editions with different designations; i.e., the “Troisième édition, revue et augmentée” has been revised and augmented since the “Deuxième édition [pas revue, pas augmentée]”.

We have some sympathy for the suggestion made by the Library of Congress to treat the entire statement as a simple edition statement in all cases – in effect to eliminate the “additional edition statement” as a separate category. After all, a manifestation with the additional edition statement is a different expression from the copy without that statement. “Third edition” and “Third edition, 2nd revised printing” identify distinct expressions and might as well be treated as separate edition statements. The problem comes when there are statements of responsibility relating to both the edition and the revised subset:

Third revised edition / by John Smith, with a 2010 update / by Thomas Jones

So we may not be able to do without the separate elements. This may be an issue that the JSC should discuss with the ISBD Review Group.

What **would** make sense, we believe, is to revise RDA to adopt the new ISBD language. This language seems to have some definite advantages. An “additional edition statement” seems clearer than a “designation of a named revision of an edition.” Furthermore, the revised ISBD specifications recognize the ambiguity of the concept of “edition” in terms of the FRBR model, by allowing for an additional edition statement to be given for an unchanged impression (e.g., “Second edition, 2nd printing”), which would be a distinct manifestation but not a distinct expression.

If there is interest in making such a revision, ALA would be happy to prepare a proposal for consideration.

In the meantime, we do not feel that the revisions proposed by ACOC are necessary or appropriate, and we are unwilling to stray from the ISBD elements that underlie these RDA elements. For these reasons, we strongly recommend that this proposal not be approved.