2. Ross Atkinson, "Transversality and the Role of the Library as Fair Witness," *Library Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (2005): 169–89.

3. Peggy Johnson, *Fundamentals of Collection Development & Management* (Chicago: ALA, 2004); G. Edward Evans, *Developing Library and Information Center Collections* (Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 2000).

4. Ross Atkinson, "Reflection on 'The Acquisitions Librarian as Change Agent in the Transition to the Electronic Lib-rary,'" *Library Resources & Technical Services* 48, no. 3 (2004): 213–15.

5. Ross Atkinson, "Introduction for the Breakout Sessions: Six Key Challenges for the Future of Collection Development." Janus Conference on Research Library Collections, Oct. 2005, http://dspace.library.cornell.edu/handle/1813/2608 (accessed Apr. 6, 2006).

The Nature of "A Work": Implications for the Organization of Knowledge. By Richard P. Smiraglia. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 2001. 182p. $56.50 cloth (ISBN 0-8108-4037-5).

In the last three to four years, attention to the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) has been growing rapidly.[1] FRBR has been hailed as a "data model [that] holds great potential for improving access to library resources," and "FRBRization" has been called a "method for turning online public finding lists into online public catalogs."[2] The revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, currently under way as RDA: Resource Description and Access, is being structured with "the conceptual models for bibliographic and authority data developed by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)" as a key element in its design.[3] However, concepts in FRBR that people find very difficult to grasp include the definitions of *work* and *expression* and how these differ from each other as well as how they differ from *manifestation*. FRBR, itself, equivocates about the nature of a work, claiming that "the concept of what constitutes a work and where the line of demarcation lies between one work and another may in fact be viewed differently from one culture to another."[4] Therefore, now seems an excellent time for a fresh look at Smiraglia's 2001 book on the nature of "a work."

Smiraglia begins by introducing basic concepts, such as "bibliographic universe," "bibliographic entity," "bibliographic family," "text," "document," and, yes, "work." The dual nature, physical and intellectual, of a bibliographic entity is discussed. He dwells a bit upon the problems of collocating works using the current MARC bibliographic record structure, comparing it with the entity-relationship model. Because FRBR uses an entity-relationship model, this comparison is useful as well as enlightening. Smiraglia's second chapter gives an historical analysis of the concept of the work in Anglo-American cataloging, thus providing us with the cultural context we need to understand "work"

in this culture versus other cultures that FRBR suggests may lead us to other views of "work." Furthering this cultural understanding are chapter 3, which reflects on how the organizing mechanisms of the profession have developed ways of identifying and demonstrating relationships among works, and chapter 4, which considers the roles that works play in society and culture, drawing upon thought and definitions offered by writers in the areas of linguistics, philosophy, literary criticism, semiotics, and bibliography. Chapters 5 and 6 discuss several research studies that have been conducted, particularly on the derivative bibliographic relationship. This is the relationship that is most evident in relating members of a given bibliographic family, the members of which should all descend from the same common progenitor (or "ancestor"). (This is also the relationship that is most problematic in determining when a new work has been created.) Finally, in chapter 7, Smiraglia presents a summary and a "first attempt" at coming up with a "theory of the work" (121). He acknowledges that the data are insufficient to state a full-blown formal theory, but he believes that "the parameters of a theory of the work" can be seen beginning to emerge (129). Several appendices add considerable value to the book. One of particular interest is a chart showing definitions of "work" from twenty-one sources, from Panizzi in 1841 to Smiriglia in 2001.

Publishing being what it is (or at least what it was six years ago), most of Smiraglia's writing for this book was completed by 1999 or 2000. FRBR, having been published in 1998, had not yet grabbed the collective attention of bibliographic organizers. Smiraglia included mention of it as indicative of international work in the area (46–48, 51, 130), but did not discuss it substantially. However, many relevant issues can be found here. For example, a theme running through the book is the idea of ideational content and semantic content, and how these affect the nature of a work. Ideational content is defined in the glossary as the "propositions expressed in a work," or what Patrick Wilson said is often the subject matter of the text (167). The semantic content is defined as the "expression of the ideational content of a work in a particular set of linguistic strings" (30). Changes in these two aspects of content of a work (albeit sometimes using different terminology to express the concepts) appear again and again in the writings of the various authors cited by Smiraglia. It is generally understood that major changes in one or the other of the ideational content or semantic content results in a new work. However, Anglo-American culture has traditionally considered successive editions of a work to be manifestations of the same work, despite the fact that many new editions contain considerable changes to semantic content. Translations may represent totally different semantic content, yet Smiraglia points out that they are generally accepted as reiterations of the original work (130). So, is a "work" really made up of all of the expressions of a

certain ideational content? But if that is the case, why would our Anglo-American culture consider a movie made from a novel to be a different work? These are practical questions that we must address as we attempt to FRBRize catalogs, and this book gives us much background, research, and analysis to use in attacking the problem.

For additional perspectives the reader is referred to a work edited by Richard Smiraglia in 2002.[5] It includes an article by Smiraglia titled "Further Reflections on the Nature of 'A Work,'" as well as a number of other articles by different people discussing the concept of "work" from a variety of viewpoints.— *Arlene G. Taylor (ataylor@mail.sis .pitt.edu), University of Pittsburgh, Pa.*

References

1. IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*, *Final Report* (München: K. G. Saur, 1998); also available at www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.htm or www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf (accessed Feb. 14, 2006).
2. Jennifer Bowen, "FRBR: Coming Soon to Your Library?" *Library Resources & Technical Services* 49, no. 3 (July 2005): 175; Martha M. Yee, "FRBRization: A Method for Turning Online Public Finding Lists into Online Public Catalogs." *Information Technology and Libraries* 24, no. 2 (June 2005): 77.
3. Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR, *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, Feb. 13, 2006, www .collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rda.html (accessed Feb. 14, 2006).
4. IFLA Study Group, *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*, 16.
5. Richard P. Smiraglia, ed., *Works as Entities for Information Retrieval* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth, 2002). Also published simultaneously as *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 33, no. 3/4 (2002).

Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR): Hype or Cure-All? Ed. Patrick Le Boeuf. Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth, 2005. $59.95 cloth (ISBN 0-7890-2798-4); $39.95 paper (ISBN 0-7890-2799-2). Published simultaneously as *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 39, no. 3/4.

The document known briefly as "FRBR" and more formally as *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Final Report*, issued by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) Section on Cataloging in 1998, has inspired much discussion in the years since it appeared.[1] This collection of eighteen articles continues that discussion. It is organized into four sections. The first offers an overview of the history and theory underlying FRBR. The second analyzes FRBR's applicability to specific types of resources, such as hand-press books, orally transmitted works, musical works, and digital collections. The third section discusses several efforts to implement FRBR. Finally, a description of XOBIS, an XML-based alternative

to the FRBR analysis of entity relationships, points toward more adventurous avenues of exploration. Anyone seeking an understanding of the FRBR model should begin with the original report. This collection then serves as a useful examination of the issues raised by FRBR.

The most crucial point to bear in mind about FRBR is that it is a conceptual model. It defines the set of entities that are important to the construction of bibliographic records and defines the relationships between them. FRBR is not a data format like MARC21, nor a rule set like AACR2, nor a mark-up language like XML. It is a set of structured ideas about what bibliographic records must contain to meet user needs. Central to the model are four hierarchically distinguished levels of bibliographic entities: works, expressions, manifestations, and items. As is often the situation with conceptual models, the powerful and persuasive simplicity of its design becomes problematic when applied to real-world cases.

One area of concern that surfaces often in the collection is the definition of the expression-level entity. In her article "Cataloging of Hand Press Materials and the Concept of Expression in FRBR," Gunilla Jonsson quotes from the FRBR report: "Strictly speaking, any change in the intellectual or artistic content constitutes a change in *expression*. Thus, if a text is revised or modified, the resulting *expression* is considered to be a new *expression,* no matter how minor the modification may be" (78–79). The report goes on to observe that such a strict definition of expression may be unwarranted in practice; but the resulting uncertainty about what constitutes different expressions troubles several of the volume's authors. Jonsson notes that books from the hand-press era are marked by typographical differences within an edition that are a poor fit for the strict definition of expression. In his discussion of the AustLit: Australian Literature Gateway's use of FRBR, Kerry Kilner reports that "A new expression is generated only when a work displays evidence of acts of intervention that impacts upon the way the work is received, or upon the meaning of the work" (93). Ketil Albertsen and Carol van Nuys's "Paradigma: FRBR and Digital Documents," describing the use of FRBR concepts in a national repository database of Norwegian digital documents, offers an even looser definition of "the *expression* level: an artist's work may have been expressed both as a novel, a movie, and a radio play" (134). The original FRBR report would have categorized these "expressions" in different forms as separate works. Discussing "Folklore Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Oral Traditions and FRBR," Yann Nicolas proposes that for orally transmitted works, "Expressions would be equivalence classes built on episodes or motifs found in manifestations, not on alphabetical characters" (192). Yann goes on to suggest that "everyone is looking for the good criterion to build expressions, but perhaps the model shouldn't define which