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“I can think of no better expression to characterize these similarities than ‘family resemblances’ ... And I shall say: ‘games’ form a family.”

Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations, §67

INTRODUCTION

It has recently proposed that names of families be covered as possible access points in the new Resource Description and Access (RDA) standard, which is intended to supersede the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2). This would be a departure from AACR2, which does not cover such names, at least not specifically. Although names of families are often assigned as subject headings, RDA’s focus will remain on descriptive cataloging, and it is the idea of family names as possible descriptive headings, that this article examines, and more specifically, the concept of families as a form of collective author. Where did this concept originate and to what extent has it been applied in the past? The article goes on to discuss whether there is a need to differentiate between personal names, corporate names, and familial names, and what would be the function of such a differentiation.
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FAMILIES AND FRBR/FRAR

The RDA proposal ties in with the recent draft revision of the “Paris Principles” (the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles) which also incorporates names of families as access points and cites the FRBR/FRANAR model, for which, the Statement claims, persons, families and corporate bodies are “Group 2 entities.”\(^2\) In Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), group 2 entities are defined as those which “represent those responsible for the intellectual or artistic content, physical production and dissemination, or custodianship of [works, expressions, manifestations and items].”\(^3\) The FRBR/FRANAR model also underpins RDA, its Prospectus stating that:

A key element in the design of RDA is its alignment with the conceptual models for bibliographic and authority data developed by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). The FRBR and FRAR models provide RDA with an underlying framework that has the scope needed to support comprehensive coverage of all types of content and media, the flexibility and extensibility needed to accommodate newly emerging resource characteristics, and the adaptability needed for the data produced to function within a wide range of technological environments.\(^4\)

However, the list of group 2 entities in FRBR does not yet, in fact, include families, only persons and corporate bodies. Person is defined as “an individual,” while corporate body as “an organization or group of individuals and/or organizations,”\(^5\) and later, as “an organization or group of individuals and/or organizations acting as a unit.”\(^6\)

On the other hand, the draft paper, Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR), produced by the IFLA UBCIM Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR), does list families as distinct a group 2 entity, along with persons and corporate bodies, and defines them as “two or more persons related by birth, marriage, adoption, or similar legal status,” whereas a corporate body is “an organization or group of persons and/or organizations acting as a unit.”\(^7\) The FRANAR group will thus be requesting the FRBR Review Group to revise the FRBR list accordingly.\(^8\)

So where does this new move to add families come from? One might consider it to be part of the trend towards cross-domain standardisation, and in particular the convergence of library and archival description standards. FRAR incorporated families on the basis of the second edition of the International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ISAAR-CPF), which is cited in FRAR.\(^9\),\(^10\) The FRBR report, on the other hand, pre-dates both editions of ISAAR-CPF, and may not have had the same level of input from the archival community, as has FRAR. Although FRBR post-dates the first edition of the General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD-G), on which ISAAR-CPF built, this document does not explicitly list families as a type of creator.\(^11\)
FAMILIES AND MARC

Does this mean that the concept of families as creators or authors is a recent introduction from the archival community? We have already noted that AACR2, the principal cataloging code of the modern English-speaking library world, does not specifically cover families. MARC21, however, the exchange format most closely associated with AACR2, does specifically accommodate names of families, and not just as subject headings. The first indicator of fields 100 (main entry), 600 (subject added entry), 700 (name added entry) and 800 (series added entry) provides for the value “3” to indicate name headings that represent “a family, clan, dynasty, house, or other such group.”

Family name coding is by no means unique to the MARC21 variant of MARC. Other major variants, including UNIMARC and UKMARC, also allow for descriptive headings for names of families. In UNIMARC, names of families have their own fields (720/722), and have had since its inception in 1977. Even some MARC variants completely outside of the Anglo-American tradition, such as INTERMARC (France), include coding specifically for names of families. On the other hand, we should also note that not all MARC variants allow for descriptive name headings for families. For instance, MAB2 only provides coding for families as subject names.

We can in fact trace the coding for names of families, in descriptive as well as subject fields, right back to MARC II, which became the basis of USMARC (and, later, MARC21). Work began at the Library of Congress on the MARC II format in March 1967; the format was published in January 1968. Names of families are coded exactly as they are in MARC21 – first indicator 3 of the X00 field for “personal name.” The MARC I format, however, published in June 1965, does not specifically code family names, only personal author tracings (tag 71) and corporate author tracings (tag 72); all subject headings are tagged 70; MARC I specifies that for main entry (tag 10), the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries (1949) are to be followed.

So why were names of families introduced in MARC II? What are the origins of “indicator 3”? One might suppose that the relative rarity of family name headings was the reason for a lack of coverage in MARC I, and that the greater level of detail allowed for their treatment in MARC II. Yet an analysis of elements found in Library of Congress catalog records created during the period 1950-1964, on which MARC II was largely based, did not apparently unearth any family name headings. This is not, in fact, too surprising when we examine the ALA Rules, which were used at the Library of Congress prior to 1967. We find only one mention of families, under rule 80C, whereby private family archives are assigned the name of the associated family (there is no rule to guide the construction of such a heading), subdivided by “Archives.” This would allow for some descriptive family name headings, but only a very small number of them.
MARC II’s development coincided with the introduction of AACR1 (March 1967). Perhaps the new code influenced MARC development in this respect? There was indeed a new rule that allowed for family name headings, 205A, dealing with the main entry for manuscript collections. Its footnote states that “Although a family is not normally a corporate body, it is accorded a heading similar to that of a corporate body. This heading is used even when a family group is a corporate body with a corporate name of its own. The form, ‘[surname] family,’ is used in most cases.”

Although this footnote means that MARC would need to accommodate headings for families, it does not follow that this was the reason for the introduction of indicator 3. If anything, the footnote suggests that family name headings would be better placed in fields for corporate names than personal names. It also specifically pertains to manuscripts, whereas early MARC development focused on book cataloging.

The origins of indicator 3 are thus unclear, both in terms of its need and its placement in the fields for personal names. It is very possible that family name headings were considered too small in number, even as subject headings, to justify their own field. It is also the case that family names look more like personal names than most corporate names, and that family and personal names usually share a common element, i.e. the surname.

This still does not explain, however, why the MARC II descriptive fields, as well as the subject field, provided for family name headings. The reason could well lie in the expansion of the subject fields that occurred between MARC I and MARC II. The single 70 field became 600, 610, 611, 620, 630, 650, 651, 652, 653 etc. Once it had been decided that family subject name headings were not “topical subject headings” (650), nor “proper names not capable of authorship” (653), but not sufficiently numerous to merit their own field, then they would need to be classed in one of the other fields, and 600 probably seemed like the best fit. On the other hand, they were clearly not ordinary “personal names,” and so were reasonably given their own indicator value.

Once family name headings were in 600, then one of the great innovations of MARC II applied: the mirroring of the name heading and uniform title coding across functions (main entry, subject entry, series entry, added entry, series added entry). However, this does not mean that the MARC II developers added the same indicator value for family name headings in 100 and 700 fields purely for the sake of consistency. There are two pieces of evidence to suggest that the developers of MARC II recognised the bibliographic possibility of a family name heading as main or non-subject added entry. First, the field 653 for “proper names not capable of authorship” was not used for family subject headings. Second, a footnote in the 4XX section states that “Although it is not anticipated that the name of the family will be used as the author portion of a series note, it is included for consistency.” The point here is that such a footnote was not included in the earlier 1XX section for main entry.
The exact origin of indicator 3 may now never be known. Mr. Kay D. Guiles, one of the few remaining MARC pioneers active in the profession, could not find any documented discussion on the matter, but guesses that its assignment in the 100 and 700 fields (as well as the 400 and 800 fields) was indeed based, in the first instance, on its assignment in 600, rather than on any particular recognition of familial authorship. Nevertheless, it is worth bearing in mind that MARC II represented a fundamental shift in approach: whereas MARC I was designed so that the Library of Congress could distribute bibliographic data to other libraries on magnetic tape, MARC II was designed so that other libraries could also distribute bibliographic data on magnetic tape. Thus “Having received a body of feedback from the MARC I participi- partiglicicicipating libraries as well as from the Library’s MARC staff, the Library has used this material to design a new MARC format that will better serve the library community. At the same time we realized that the new MARC format should have enough built-in flexibility to serve as the standardised communications format for a wide variety of bibliographic data.” In other words, there was a realisation that MARC needed to be able to accommodate other bibliographic elements not found in LC book cataloging, and it would not have been too much of a stretch for descriptive family name headings to be one such element.

Mr. Guiles does recall discussion of whether family names might be treated as a form of corporate name rather than personal name, based on the idea that a family name was akin to a name for a “family association,” which would be corporate. However, Mr. Guiles states that this idea “did not seem as readily applicable to royal houses (Aragon, House of; Hanover, House of) or dynasties (Umayyad dynasty; Ptolemaic dynasty) and the concept of family names as corporate names was not really pursued seriously.”

In any case, whatever its origins, indicator 3 allowed for not only the application of AACR1 rule 205A, but also opened up the possibility of familial authorship outside of manuscript collections – a possibility that remains open in MARC21. It is interesting that only recently has this possibility been reflected in discussions of code revision, and that AACR2 shut out the possibility altogether – or at least was interpreted as having done so – rather than expanded the concept of familial authorship to non-manuscript contexts.

**FAMILIES AND THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING TRADITION**

We have seen that the concept of familial authorship, or at least, family name headings as non-subject access points, is not altogether new in library cataloging. AACR1 and MARC indicate that the notion has been present in the Anglo-American tradition for some time, albeit rather peripherally. Even with the advent of AACR2, which makes no mention of families, the Library of Congress retained the essence of the AACR1 footnote, with the following Cataloging Service Bulletin directive: “Although not illustrated in AACR 2, family names may be used as main or added entry headings in one instance: collections of manuscripts...”
Outside of manuscript and subject cataloging, however, the Anglo-American treatment of families appears very limited. We have seen that the 1949 ALA Rules contain only one passing reference to family name headings as access points, in rule 80C. If we examine the pre-1949 codes, we find no coverage at all: not in the 1941 or 1908 codes, nor in Cutter’s Rules. If we look at other background documents which led to AACR1, we find no mention of family names either: not in the “Paris Principles,” nor in Lubetzky’s Code of Cataloging Rules.

On the other hand, we can, of course, trace the concept of corporate authorship to the beginnings of the Anglo-American tradition – to Panizzi, Cutter, et al. Cutter’s general principle is that “Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority.” The binary division of personal and corporate names is to be found in all the twentieth century Anglo-American codes, with a further tripartite division of corporate bodies into “societies,” “institutions” and “miscellaneous” in the pre-AACR rules, before Lubetzky demonstrated its artificiality in his famous critique of the 1949 Rules.

The Anglo-American cataloging tradition, both pre- and post-AACR, is essentially based on the notion of two forms of author, personal and corporate. Although families were not usually considered to fall under either form, they were also not considered significant enough bibliographically to represent a third form of authorship at anything like the same level as personal and corporate authorship. The fact that families are distinguished from corporate bodies in AACR1, but only in a footnote, illustrates well the position of familial authorship in the general Anglo-American tradition.

**FAMILIES ON WORLDCAT**

If the Anglo-American cataloging codes only deal with names of families in relation to manuscripts, has Anglo-American practice been equally restrictive? A brief survey was carried out on OCLC WorldCat to assess the extent to which descriptive family name headings might be applicable in non-manuscript contexts. “Family” was searched as a keyword in non-subject personal name headings in bibliographic records for items published (or created) in 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000. Table 1 shows the distribution of records by type of material. “Non-applicable” records were those with headings that had been mis-tagged, were in name-title form (with “family” in the title), or were for persons with “Family” as a surname.

**TABLE 1. Family name headings by type of material and publication year**
For all four years, we see that manuscripts account for a significant proportion of records, and half or more of applicable records in the case of three years – obviously a far greater proportion than they would account for in the total population of WorldCat records (particularly given that manuscripts are less likely to have these relatively recent publication/creation dates). This, of course, ties in with the treatment of families in manuscript cataloging codes, and the lack of treatment of families in general cataloging codes. The manuscript materials represented by the records from the survey were mostly collections of family papers, or single manuscripts pertaining to genealogy. AACR1 rule 205A would likely have been applied in the case of many of the 1970, and perhaps some of the 1980, records. From 1983 onwards, many manuscript catalogers would have adopted the standard, *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* (APPM), instead of AACR, which allows for family name headings, as did the 1984 *Cataloging Service Bulletin* directive mentioned earlier.33

The survey does show some family name headings for non-manuscript material. However, many of these headings did not appear to represent “authorship,” and most had no corresponding statement of responsibility. Many of the printed books were *about* particular families, written by one particular member, or by an outsider. Others were catalogs of exhibitions, etc., featuring a family’s work or life. There were several books of “family recipes,” and a few (published) collections of letters. Most of the headings for the sound recordings were musical groups, some of these featuring a real family, others not. Several family name headings, for both manuscripts and non-manuscripts, were for the *donor*, rather than the author or subject.

Thus only a very few of the non-manuscript materials might be said to have been *by* a particular family, in the conventional bibliographic sense of authorship. This is reflected in the absence of appropriate statements of responsibility. Rare examples that might suggest “authorship” were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed book</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound recording</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descendants of Jared Pratt, his daughter Mary, and his five sons, Anson, William, Parley, Orson and Nelson / Jared Pratt Family Association.

My favorite sermon / by the Mitchell’s.

Greetings from the Tyrol [sound recording] / Stangl Wirt und Familie.

Itaya family recipes.

FAMILIES AS ACCESS POINTS

In both theory and practice, then, manuscript librarians and archivists consider it necessary to provide, on occasion, access points to their catalogs based on the names of families. Many archives and manuscript collections include family papers, and these papers are commonly searched for as such, that is, via the name of the family. Outside of manuscripts, however, library collections do not contain many items with statements of responsibility (except for acknowledgments) that mention families, and thus library catalogers would not have found much need, in general, to assign names of families as non-subject access points.

The next question, then, is whether this difference between manuscript and non-manuscript cataloging is simply a quantitative one, that is, familial authors produce mostly manuscripts, or whether it is in fact a qualitative one, that is, the nature of the material and the purpose of its collection, leads to a different approach to access point provision. In other words, could rules concerning the provision of family name headings be generalised beyond manuscripts, even if they might not be applicable very frequently in the case of other library materials?

Descriptive access points in library catalogs have traditionally focused on authorship. Even added entry headings usually represent entities that have made some contribution to a resource’s creation – co-authors in a broad sense. Headings are thus based, for the most part, on statements of responsibility, which are defined in AACR as “A statement, transcribed from the item being described, relating to persons responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of the item, to corporate bodies from which the content emanates, or to persons or corporate bodies responsible for the performance of the content of the item.” Responsibility is thus focused on the content, but is wide-ranging in scope. For instance, a letter may be written by a single person, but normally involves an addressee, who is indirectly responsible for its content – the letter would probably not
have been created if it were not for the other person. The name of the addressee may thus be assigned an added entry heading (AACR2 21.30F1).

Is this concept of authorship broad enough to encompass families? In the case of family papers, we might have a collection of manuscripts written by or to members of a particular family. The family members, or at least some of them, are directly or indirectly responsible for each letter. They may or may not be responsible for the collection – the papers could have been collected by an outside party – but they would at least be partly responsible for its existence.

The issue here is that we have identified family members as being directly and/or indirectly responsible, rather than the family as a whole. There would appear to be no problem with assigning headings for individuals, but what about for the family? A family may not have made a collective decision to collect the letters. It might have been made, and carried out, by one or two particular members of the family, or by an outsider. Can the family as a whole still be said to be responsible, or partly responsible, for the collection? Does it need to have made a collective decision in order to qualify for a collective name heading?

If a family – or any other group for that matter – has not made a collective decision, it has not, by definition, made any decision (only individual members might have done so). So the question is really whether a group can be an unintentional author. If not, then a family could only qualify for a collective heading if and when it was a corporate author, that is, an author which acted (or claimed to have acted) as an entity, entailing a collective decision. (The nature of collective intention has been hotly debated by contemporary philosophers such as Margaret Gilbert.)

Before we explore intentionality and authorship, we shall first consider other possible objections to families as descriptive access points. A name heading has to represent its corresponding entity, and had to be one on which catalog users might search. Clearly, users identify families by particular names (e.g. “Ghandi family”) and often search for materials about families through these names as subject headings. It may well be that not all members of a family contribute to a collection of papers, but a family name heading can still represent the family as a whole, just as a heading for a committee can still be assigned without all members of the committee being responsible for a particular report, and just as a heading for a musical group can still be assigned without all members of the group contributing to a particular song. Not all family members may have been born, not all may be in a position to contribute (especially ancestors), but the same can be said for the membership of many other groups.

Let us return, then, to the question of intentionality. We noted earlier that AACR allows for added entry headings for addressees, even if they have played no direct role in the writing of the
letters. This would suggest that authorial contributions do not need to be deliberate. Other examples of unintentional authorship, in the broad sense, include the adaptation of works – the author of the original work is assigned an added entry, even if he or she is deceased by the time of the adaptation. However, one might take unintentionality to extremes. A biography would not have been written if it had not been for the life of its subject – does the name of the subject thus automatically qualify as an added entry point? Does a book about a football club require a descriptive added entry heading for the football club, as the book could not have been created without the club’s existence?

Catalogers normally only assign subjects as descriptive headings when there is a fairly close and explicit relationship between subject and the work’s creation. In the case of archival material, this relationship is often so close as to be almost coterminous. Family papers tend to reveal information about a family, more than about any other particular subject. However, rather than authorship or subject, archivists often talk in terms of provenance. This is a concept that goes beyond authorship in the traditional library sense, but does not equate to subject. It is about the context of a collection, which is commonly a particular institution, or series of institutions, but can be a family – an institution in the anthropological sense. It is this context which ISAAR-CPF aims to describe; the standard defines provenance thus: “The relationships between records and the organisations or individuals that created, accumulated and/or maintained and used those records in the conduct of personal or corporate activity.” (A more limited definition is given in the draft RDA, based on ownership and custodianship.)

The difference between the archival concept of provenance and the library concept of authorship must rest, in part, on the nature of the material with which archivists and librarians tend to deal. Archivists manage collections of often unique materials that were usually not intended for public consumption when they were first created, nor necessarily intended for eventual collection, and which were often generated by a large number of people performing particular organisational roles. Librarians, on the other hand, manage mostly discrete publications, often authored by one or a few people. As a result, librarians’ concept of authorship has tended to emphasise intentional creation at the item level, whereas archivists’ concept of provenance has emphasised the context, especially the institutional context, of the generation and maintenance of records at the collection level – bypassing, to some extent, the issue of intentionality.

The focus on intentional creation, a perfectly reasonable one given the library context, is why library catalogers have established relatively few descriptive headings for non-corporate groups, and why the Anglo-American cataloging tradition is largely based on the binary classification, personal and corporate authorship. Even when items might lend themselves to access via a non-corporate group heading, the rules have provided catalogers with limited scope for assigning one.
Meanwhile, library catalogers have had few encounters with families because, outside of manuscript collections, familial authorship, and particularly intentional family authorship, is rare. This is not to say that it is non-existent: families may publish materials corporately. Examples include “family association” publications (e.g. those issued by Jared Pratt Family Association, which has its own website at http://jared.pratt-family.org), resources issued by family businesses, and family-based music recordings.

For manuscript catalogers, however, familial authorship is a much more common occurrence, particularly in terms of unintentional, non-corporate authorship. Whereas general library catalogers would normally hesitate to assign descriptive headings to represent such authorship, manuscript catalogers are likely to approach access point provision more from an archival viewpoint, in which case institutional context, rather than intention or corporateness, is key.
WHERE TO WITH FAMILIES?

If families can be corporate, but are often not, and if their names are an important access point for manuscript curators, where does this leave the proposal to treat them as a distinct form of name in the new RDA? While it is clear that names of families do not really qualify as personal name headings, and would appear to have been subsumed under the personal name fields in MARC largely through historical accident, families may be both corporate and non-corporate, bibliographically, depending on the resource being cataloged.

We see this ambiguity – corporate or non-corporate – in terms of the traditional “capitalisation test.” Most family name headings in WorldCat have a lower-case “f” for “family,” though there are a few capitals, whereas corporate names, in the English language, are usually presented in capitals, i.e. as proper nouns. Groups which are non-corporate bibliographically are also probably non-corporate in terms of their name. For instance, the Browns have probably never made a collective decision to call themselves “the Brown Family.” They just “became” the Brown family, and are referred to as such by individuals (including family members) from time to time.

Families, however, are by no means the only groups which may be non-corporate. We might compare hypothetical statements of responsibility such as “by the residents of Ramsey Street” or “by the citizens of Wagga Wagga.” One could perhaps apply rule 1.1F14 of AACR2, which deals with those statements of responsibility where no person or body is named, but “residents of Ramsey Street” and “citizens of Wagga Wagga” are names – the question is whether they are bodies. They do not necessarily represent bodies in the corporate sense, but they could well do in the group sense.

Seymour Lubetzky criticised the construction of “class of citizen” name headings under the 1949 Rules, such as “London. Women,” because the construction was performed by the cataloger, rather by the authors or the catalog users. If, however, the heading is derived from a statement of responsibility on the item, such as “by the residents of Ramsey Street,” then it is quite conceivable that the name provides a useful access point, even if it is not corporate. An indication that the phrase represents a group would, in English, be the definite article: “by residents of Ramsey Street” would probably imply only some residents, an aggregation of individual residents rather than a group, whereas “by the residents of Ramsey Street” would generally be taken to stand for a group (even if not every single resident). Similarly, “by the Ghandi family” implies the Ghandi family as a group, whereas “by members of the Ghandi family” does not.

Whether a family name heading should be capitalised or not, is not an especially serious matter. It is reasonable for a rule to assume that most families are forever non-corporate, and to
specify that “family” not be capitalised. The more important principle is that the heading is constructed on the basis of the most commonly known form of the name, whether, for example, “Brown family” or “Browns, The (Family).” When families change name, either through a gradual evolution of spelling or through a more dramatic circumstance, the question arises as to whether this should be dealt with through a see or a see also reference. Perhaps a corporate name treatment is the more appropriate, whereby all new names are assumed to represent a different composition of members, and a different entity.

What is a serious matter, however, is whether or not non-corporate groups can be “authors” in the first place, and thus qualify for descriptive access points in library cataloguing. Given the overlap between manuscript cataloging and archival description, it seems reasonable for librarians to revise their concept of authorship, so as to encompass the concept of provenance. We recall that FRBR’s “authors” are included in the group 2 entities, which are defined as those “responsible for the intellectual or artistic content, physical production and dissemination, or custodianship of [works, expressions, manifestations and items].” This is an expansion of the AACR statement of responsibility definition, which appears to focus on creation, as indeed does the proposed RDA definition (“a statement relating to the identification and/or function of any persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible for or contributing to the creation or realization of the intellectual or artistic content of a resource”). In contrast, group 2 entities include manufacturers and publishers (“production and dissemination”), and custodians.

The FRBR group 2 definition coincides with most of the ISAAR-CPF definition of provenance: “The relationships between records and the organisations or individuals that created, accumulated and/or maintained and used those records in the conduct of personal or corporate activity.” A collection is created through accumulation, and its maintenance equates to its custodianship. The additional activity in the ISAAR-CPF definition is use. The FRBR definition could be amended to accommodate this: “those responsible for the intellectual or artistic content, physical production and dissemination, custodianship or use of resources.” Although use may be considered to be generally outside the scope of authorship in the sense of intentional authorship, if “authors” are responsible not only for the creation, but for the existence of a resource, then users may be authors in the sense that they may be responsible, at least in part, for its continued existence – unwittingly or otherwise. In this very broad conceptualisation, “authors” provide the context of resources’ existence, that is, their provenance.

In many cases, specific users are not bibliographically important and would not be connected to the resource in the mind of the catalog user, and so would not feature as an access point. However, in some cases, particularly archival ones, an institution or family or person might be connected to a resource by virtue of their use of that resource, without having created it, and without being its legal owner or custodian. It is important to note here that most resources that have “intended audiences” are aimed at categories of user rather than a group of users. That is, they are aimed at members of a group (women, postgraduates, etc.), rather than being intended for use
by the group as a whole. Thus intended audiences would not usually cover this extended definition of authorship.

Such a broad definition of group 2 entities would, however, allow for not only the addition of families, but for non-corporate groups in general. Families may commonly fall into the non-corporate category, but so might other types of group, such as residencies and citizenries. There appears to be no theoretical reason to restrict the non-corporate group category to families; and there appears nothing intrinsically bibliographical about groups in which “two or more persons [are] related by birth, marriage, adoption, or similar legal status” to warrant them a category all to themselves.41

If this third class of name was to be added to the existing personal and corporate categories, then the current AACR definition for corporate body could be retained: “An organization or group of persons that is identified by a particular name and that acts, or may act, as an entity.”42 However, the fact that intentionality and collective decision-making is often hard to either confirm or deny, from the bibliographic evidence, and the fact that families and other groups may be both corporate and non-corporate, suggests that the distinction may not be very practical, nor particularly helpful. It would seem unnecessary, after all, to distinguish between intentional and unintentional personal authorship (e.g. letter writer versus addressee), and is not something that has ever been done.

Therefore, a better way forward may well be not to make the corporate/non-corporate distinction, but rather to revisit the “corporate body” category, expanding it so as to embrace both intentional and unintentional collective authorship. Instead of “corporate body” a better phrase might be simply “group of persons.” Such a term would fit well, in fact, with the first FRBR definition of corporate body: “an organization or group of individuals and/or organizations.”43

In this way, there would still be two group 2 entities, persons and groups of persons, and instances of either category would fit across the whole range of activities encompassed by the amended definition of group 2 entities proposed above: “those responsible for the intellectual or artistic content, physical production and dissemination, custodianship or use of resources.” The emphasis on corporateness, in relation to groups, is an emphasis which dates back to a world of card and printed catalogs, when entries were costly and the nature of the main entry was critical. In modern resource description and access, such an emphasis is no longer necessary, and the validity of all name headings, whether personal, corporate or non-corporate, should be dependent on the answer to one basic question – is it a heading that a catalog user might wish to search under?
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