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Visibility And Invisibility Of The Kinship Relationships In Bibliographic Families Of The Library Catalogue

Abstract: A revision of the taxonomies of the bibliographic relationships is made settled down by Tillett, Leazer or the study Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records of the IFLA. A group of bibliographic records of related works is analyzed, that we have denominated bibliographic families, in the union catalogue of REBIUN (Net of University Libraries). The techniques more used by the cataloguing rules and the IBERMARC Format are identified to show the derivative relationships in the catalogue and it is concludes that many of those "kinship relationships" existent in the bibliographic families they are not made explicit for data elements and the access points of the bibliographic records.

1. The bibliographic relationships in the catalogue.

1.1. Bibliographic entities, works and items.

One of the problems of some studies of use of the catalogue of the library that try to determine the group of elements of necessary data in the bibliographic records is, according to Holley, that consider the habitants of the bibliographic universe as discretes entities, more than as members of a galactic interconnected system. In consequence, they don't consider the data elements whose main function is to organize the catalogue, that is to say, to provide structure (Holley, 1992, p. 65-66).

Our current vision of the conceptual structure of the catalogue can be traced at least already from a date as distant as mid-nineteenth century when Panizzi defended strongly the library catalogue as the vital instrument to access a library's holdings. Their rules reflect a conceptual structure based on the entries, that is, single and full records for each catalogued item, and three classes of cross references to link the user's choice with the catalogue entry. The conceptual structure of the catalogue consists, therefore, "records", composed of "data elements" and of "links" among the records. Linked records form "clusters" that share a particular type of relationship. Records are elaborated to describe bibliographic entities and to control subjects and the names used as access points, including personal, corporate, conference and geographical names, as well as the titles, mainly the titles of works or component-parts of works (Tillett, 1989, p. 150).

A renovated attention toward the nature and the characteristics of the informative catalogue unit has come determined by the potentiality of the new technologies (and for the logic of the computer) of decomposing the monodimensional rigid structure of the catalogue data and of articulating a complex net of relationships around an informative basic unit, with the purpose of
determining a descriptive format constituted by data integrables according to the bibliographic attributes that want to be indicated in having response to the users' certain demands (Grimaldi, 1993, p. 134).

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that more than two decades from have already lapsed the incorporation of the computers in the library tasks, the transition of the catalogue of cards to the on-line catalogues is still in its initial stages. As Svenonius points out (2000, p. 63-64), this slow transition is due in part to difficulty in understanding the function of the bibliographic record in an electronic environment. Bibliographic records in MARC format are fairly well suited to communicating bibliographic data but they are not well designed for computer manipulation of this data.

A bibliographic record is a description of a bibliographic entity that is formatted and inscribed on a medium. A bibliographic entity is a unique instance of recorded knowledge, e.g., an opera, a play, etc. Each bibliographic entity has both physical and intellectual properties. The item is the physical property represented in the catalogue by a transcribed record of its inherent bibliographic characteristics (the item's dimensions, its details of publication, etc.). The work is the intellectual content of a bibliographic entity (Smiraglia and Leazer, 1999). Any work has two properties: a) the expressed propositions; and b) the expression of those propositions (usually a certain group of linguistic or musical strings, etc.) which forms linguistic content. Any change in ideational or linguistic content results in the creation of a new work.

Descriptive cataloguing generally intends to provide the user with information about: a) the item described as physical entity, and b) work(s) contained in the document, i.e., the item's intellectual content. To differentiate between these two aspects, the term "document" is usually applied to the item described as physical entity and the term "work" to the intellectual content of the item.

1.2. Types of bibliographic relationships.

A bibliographic relationship is an association between two or more works or bibliographic documents. Some examples are the publication circumstances that link two or more bibliographic documents, as the attribution to the same author, to contain a variation of the same work, or documents that are part of the same series.

For the automated catalogue to bring together related items, the works within a collection must be identified systematically within the cataloguing database. When a computer retrieves items according to a specified search strategy, it separates the collection into two distinct groups: those that satisfy the search and those that do not. If the search is very specific and only a few items are retrieved, it may not be necessary to order these items further. One may only need to scan the bibliographic data to choose the desired items. The retrieved items, however, are not necessarily unrelated to the items not retrieved. A more general search strategy will retrieve some of these items, but as the strategy is generalized, the relationship between any two items can become weaker. Retrieved items should be displayed to represent the varying interrelationships among them (Van Houten, 1981, p. 370).

For their own nature, some relationships are more tenuous and more subjective than others. For example, it is much easier to judge if a work is a translation than if it is a parody (Holley, 1992, p. 61). Also, the bibliographic relationships can be multidimensional. For example, the second edition of a work can be published in a different series different from the first edition, a reprint of a
sound record of rock can contain a new sound replacing the sound track of the original record and a collection of microforms often compiles material of several publications (Hagler, 1997).

Probably the most significant work on the bibliographic relationships is the definition of relationships in the UNIMARC Format (1977 and 1980). The definitions of bibliographic relationships found in the UNIMARC Format (1980, p. 58-59) suggest a philosophical framework for the bibliographic relationships by categorizing them into the following three types:

1. **Vertical**: they are the hierarchical relationships of the whole to their parts and the parts to a whole, for example, downward links (a serial to its subseries or to individual volumes of the series) or upward links (the individual volume to its subseries and/or series).

2. **Horizontal**: they are the relationships between versions of a document in different languages, formats, media, etc.

3. **Chronological**: they are the relationships in the time between issues of a document, for example, the relationship of a serial to its predecessors and successors.

Barbara Tillett carried out an empiric study during the years 1984-1986 that it constituted her doctoral dissertation. The author has developed a taxonomy that "can be seen as an expansion and clarification of the categorizations of the original UNIMARC" (Tillett, 1988, p. 5). The seven types of bibliographic relationships derived from this study are the following ones:

1. **Equivalence relationships**: they are given between exact copies of the same manifestation of a work, or between an original document and their reproductions, as long as the intellectual and artist content and authorship are preserved.

2. **Derivative relationships**: they are given between a bibliographic document and a modification based on the same document.

3. **Descriptive relationships**: they are given between a work or bibliographic document and a description, criticism, evaluation or review of that work, such as between a document and a review describing it. Also included are annotated editions, commentaries, critiques, etc. (Tillett, 1991b, p. 156).

4. **Whole-part (or part-whole) relationships**: they are given between a component part of a work or bibliographic document and its whole, as with an individual selection from and the whole anthology, collection or series (Tillett, 1991b, p. 156).

5. **Accompanying relationships**: they are given between a bibliographic document and the bibliographic document it accompanies as, for example, between two documents where one is predominant and the other subordinate or where documents are of equal status.

6. **Sequential relationships**: they are given between bibliographic documents that continue or precede one another, as between the successive titles of a serial, the sequels of a monograph or among the various parts of a numbered series (Tillett, 1991b, p. 156).

7. **Shared characteristics relationships**: they are given between a bibliographic document and other bibliographic documents that is not otherwise related but coincidentally has a common author, title, subject or other characteristic used as access point in a catalogue, such as a language, publication date or publication country (Tillett, 1991b, p. 156). This type of relationships is the most
general of all, because they are given whenever an access point is duplicated in a certain file (Tillett, 1991a, p. 402).

Barbara Tillett's enumeration almost covers the whole spectrum of bibliographic relationships that can be given at item level. Vellucci (1997) examined six of these seven categories in their study of music's catalogs. Zagorskaya (2000, p. 16) intends to add other two types of relationships:

8. Relationships concerning the types of material or genre (common title or form).

9. Relationships between documents with a common historical background (for early printed books: collections, ex-libris, bindings, marginalia, etc.).

The model offered by the IFLA Study Group on Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records in 1996 (FRBR, 1998) also describes bibliographic relationships on the bibliographic record component level, as it is based both on general catalogue functions (search, identification, selection and retrieval) as on bibliographic record functions. The model contains three "entity" groups and its three corresponding bibliographic relationships groups. These are:

(a) entity representing the products of scholarly or artistic creative effort (works, expressions, manifestations, and items/documents),

(b) entity intellectually responsible for the products (persons and corporate bodies),

(c) entity forming the subject of creative effort (concepts, objects, events and places).

Bibliographic relationships between these entities are represented on the following three levels:

1. Relationships between elements within a bibliographic record;

2. Relationships between bibliographic records, implemented via access points;

3. Relationships between bibliographic records, implemented by catalogue complexes.

1.3. Super records, superworks and bibliographic families.

As an alternative to the traditional bibliographic records based on the item as basic unit of description, Fattahi (1996) proposed two kinds of "super records", constructed for the effective discharge of the collocating function: one for voluminous authors containing the author heading and titles of the works by that author; and one for voluminous titles which have different editions and manifestations.

Super records for works are a device for incorporating the concept of superwork, i.e., the set of all documents deriving from an ur-work (Svenonius, 2000, p. 98). Smiraglia and Leazer (1999) use the expression bibliographic family to designate a set of related bibliographic works derived from to common progenitor. From the perspective of the FRBR, the work is the beginning of the bibliographic family, the composition of one or more texts that are "head of the household" of the successive members of the family (Grimaldi, 2000).

2. Visibility of the kinship relationships: a concrete study.

The works or items that are part of the bibliographic families are usually represented in the catalogue by independent records. The derivative relationships or "kinship relationship" among these records are shown to the users that consult the
OPAC by means of the data elements of records and the form in that are presented. This, in turn, comes determined by the standards and cataloguing formats used in the libraries.

2.1. Objectives of the study.

This study is to determine until point the current standards "show" sufficiently to the users the "kinship relationships" existent among the related works (works published simultaneously in two editions, works that are revised with posteriority to its first edition, different translations, adaptations, representations of the same work, etc.).

2.2. Methodology.

We have carried out an intentional sampling (that is to say, the bibliographic records of works have been selected that maintain to each other kinships relationships of interesting for our study) in the union catalogue of REBIUN and an exhaustive analysis of all the elements, fields and subfields susceptibles of "to guide" to the user of the catalogue of one to another related record.

2.3. Results.

The preliminary results indicate that the techniques more used to represent the derivative relationships are the points of access of the related records (uniform titles, subjects headings, common main headings and added headings: fields lxx, 6xx and 7xx of the IBERMARC Format), edition mentions (subfield $a$ of the field 250 of IBERMARC Format), notes of different nature (fields 5xx of the IBERMARC Format), references of the authority system, etc. Nevertheless, the complexity of many of the "kinship relationships" existent in the bibliographic families (and that can be implicit in the conceptual maps of the users that carry out a search in the catalogue) are not made explicit for the data elements of and the points of access of the bibliographic records. Furthermore, the different practices of cataloguing of the university libraries contribute in certain cases to hide these kinship relationships.

3. Conclusions.

In conclusion, we consider it necessary that those responsible for the departments of technical services of the Spanish libraries systems introduce some modifications in the cataloguing policy to give more relief to the attributes that are good to show these existent relationships in the bibliographic families. In the longer term, it is considered indispensable the realization of studies of the behavior of the users that contribute more information on the "sailing maps" that use in their searches in the catalogue, later on, carry out a revision of the cataloguing rules and of the bibliographic and authorities formats that facilitate quicker and more effective identification and retrieval of works with complex bibliographic relationships. In this sense, we think that the study Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records is a good starting point for this revision.

Notes
1. Part of this work has been elaborated in the mark of the investigation project la estructura conceptual del registro bibliográfico: fundamentación teórica y estudio de un caso (SA082/01 indexes), subsidized by the Consejería de Educación y Cultura de la Junta de Castilla y León and the Fondo Social Europeo (Orden de 6 Febrero de 2001, B.O.C.yL. de 15 de Febrero de 2001).
2. REBIUN (Net of University Libraries). The on-line catalogue REBIUN is the last project developed by the Spanish universities with the objective that the combined funds of all them are unified and available the 24 hours of the day. Their upgrade is carried out every two months, and at the present time it contains the holdings of 52 Spanish universities. It can be consulted in the following address: http://www.crue.org/cgi-bin/rebiun.

3. An illustrative example is the cataloguing of the edition in microform of the doctoral dissertation *Análisis del comentario de Proclo a Crátílio de Platón* of Joaquin Ritoré Ponce. In the catalogue of REBIUN two bibliographic records of the same item appear. Only in one of the universities a added entry of author-title has been taken out *Crátílio* of Platón.
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