



A Conceptual Model for the New *Soggettario*: Subject Indexing in the Light of FRBR

Pino Buizza & Mauro Guerrini

To cite this article: Pino Buizza & Mauro Guerrini (2002) A Conceptual Model for the New *Soggettario*: Subject Indexing in the Light of FRBR, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 34:4, 31-45, DOI: [10.1300/J104v34n04_05](https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v34n04_05)

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v34n04_05



Published online: 02 Nov 2010.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 64



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 8 View citing articles [↗](#)

A Conceptual Model for the New *Soggettario*: Subject Indexing in the Light of FRBR

Pino Buizza
Mauro Guerrini

ABSTRACT. The National Central Library in Florence, Italy, has commissioned a feasibility study for the renewal of the *Soggettario* [*Subject headings for Italian libraries*]. [It is indispensable for the theoretical development to take place within the international debate and to approach the topic of a new *Soggettario* with reference to the FRBR.] The subject is analysed as a relation between the *entities in the third group: concept, object, event, place* and the entity *work*. The model identifies the logical entities, attributes and relationships which run between the entities. The article returns to and amplifies the *user tasks* of FRBR which involve a subject: (1) *Find* the works on a given subject; (2) *Find* the works in which a concept is significantly treated; (3) *Select* a work by its main subject only; (4) *Lead* to a search for works on

Pino Buizza, Queriniana Library, Via Mazzini, 1-25121, Brescia, Italy is a Member of the Italian Library Association (AIB) Cataloging Committee (E-mail: GBuizza@comune.brescia.it). Mauro Guerrini is Professor of Library Science and Cataloguing, Università di Firenze, Department of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Piazza Brunelleschi, 4-50121, Firenze, Italy. He is also Chairman of the Italian Library Association (AIB) Cataloging Committee (E-mail: m.guerrini@leonet.it or www.leonet.it/people/guerrini).

The text takes up and extends the report, co-written by the two authors and presented by Mauro Guerrini, at the study seminar on the renewal of the *Soggettario per i cataloghi delle biblioteche italiane*, promoted by Ifnet and the National Central Library, Florence, held in the Sala Lorenzo of the Library on April 5-6, 2001, with the participation of Italian and international experts.

This article was originally written in Italian and published in *Bollettino AIB*, Roma, vol. 41, no. 3 (September 2001), p. [327]-336. It is published here with the permission of Giovanni Solimine, director of the *Bollettino AIB*.

Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 34(4) 2002
<http://www.haworthpressinc.com/store/product.asp?sku=J104>
© 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

related subjects; (5) *Lead* to a search for works in which related or connected subjects are handled. [Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800- HAWORTH. E-mail address: <getinfo@haworthpressinc.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]

KEYWORDS. FRBR, subject indexing, Italian subject cataloging

1. PREFACE

The initiative of the National Central Library in Florence (BNCF), Italy, to commission a feasibility study for the renewal of the *Soggettario per i cataloghi delle biblioteche italiane* [Subject Headings for Italian libraries] to Ifnet srl, which is the origin of the proposal under discussion,¹ may be interpreted as an attempt to complete the work begun by Emanuele Casamassima which appeared in the *Soggettario*, in 1956.² The publication of *Voci di soggetto. Aggiornamento 1986-1996* [Subject Headings. Update 1986-1996], published in 1997 (and the *Update 1986-1998* published in 1999), represents a result of great scientific value in the management of a revised edition of the *Soggettario*—introducing a new, syndetic instrument with a partial application of ISO 2788—and simultaneously demonstrates that a mere update is not enough. Both an overall reconsideration of the structure and the establishment of explicit regulations for correct use are necessary.

The work begun by Antonia Ida Fontana, director of the National Library, in creating the conditions for the publication of a new edition of the *Soggettario* has been awaited since 1965. At the XVI Conference of the Associazione italiana biblioteche [Italian Library Association] (Bolzano, Merano, (Italy) 3-6 October 1965) Luigi Crocetti and Diego Maltese called for the production of an updated edition of the *Soggettario*, less than ten years after its publication, to include both terminology (replacement or modification of <<improper, obsolete and erroneous headings, etc.>>) and << the structure of the *Soggettario* (e.g., relationships between subjects)>>.³ Casamassima tried to illustrate the principles which inspired the creation and construction of the *Soggettario* in an essay which appeared in 1966 in *La documentazione in azienda*⁴ and was later republished, revised and updated in *Manuale del catalogatore* published in 1970.⁵ Since 1956 the BNCF has not produced documents or notes on the internal debate or the modifications introduced. Since 1992 the careful monitoring of the practices of the Bibliografia Nazionale Italiana carried out by <<CBT.doc>> [Biblio-

graphic Catalog, Trento, Italy] has become necessary to learn about the formal modifications, but certainly not to know about the modifications to the indexing policy of the BNI.

A commission for the updating of the *Soggettario* has never been formed, a limitation which unfortunately affects other work, tools (e.g., *Regole italiane di catalogazione per autori*, RICA) and is a source of much dissatisfaction among Italian librarians. In 1988 Maltese tried to produce rules for the *Soggettario*, the RICAS, on the basis of the *Regeln für den Schlagwort-katalog*, but it remained an unfinished draft, as per its subtitle, reminding us of the lesson of Lubetzky.⁶

Changes to information retrieval systems make occasional revisions necessary for all indexing tools, even though they are monitored constantly. Current discussion of semantic indexing currently involves even LCSH, as we can see from the monographic issue, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, vol. 29, nos 1-2, (2000), entitled *The LCSH Century: One Hundred Years with the Library of Congress Subject Headings System*, and a broad international comparison, as shown by the IFLA study *Principles Underlying Subject Heading Languages (SHLs)*.⁷

In recent decades, especially in Great Britain, a new line of investigation has developed, that is a rigorous and far-reaching investigation of subject indexing: document analysis, subject syntax according to the deep structure of the text, the criteria of coherence and functionality of vocabulary, and the semantic relations to contextualize indexing terms. If we exclude PRECIS, these studies have remained at the edge of subject heading practice and have had little or no effect on the renewal of traditional instruments such as LCSH. In Italy however, they have had an original follow up in GRIS,⁸ after the project for an Italian PRECIS.⁹ Today, the skills developed are turned to the renewal of the *Soggettario* and two parallel lines of investigation are coming together. This contribution itself owes much to the development and instruction provided by GRIS, as the informed eye can see, reading between the lines even where different terminology has been adopted.

The idea, then, to rethink the whole *Soggettario* assumes an important value for indexing policy: the time is right and the Italian librarianship climate is favourable, trusting in the action undertaken by the National Library in Florence.

While certain particular aspects of semantic indexing have necessarily national characteristics, or rather, are linked to the linguistic and cultural context of the country, it is indispensable for the theoretic development to take place within the international debate and that the new working instrument be conceived as part of the logic of international cataloguing cooper-

ation and integration, planning its use with electronic technology. Cooperating, unifying the principles, methods, rules, systems, services, searching and discovering a common language do not harm traditional Italian culture, but rather, enhance it.

The proposals presented by the Ifnet Working Group highlight a deep knowledge of the theory of semantic indexing and a flexible, aware ability to apply the theory to the analysis of the *Soggettario* and the tradition of Italian cataloguing which derives from the National Library in Florence. It is rather difficult to discuss the proposals specifically, because the group which presented them brings together the greatest Italian experts; it is as though the Italian library community had granted (or delegated) to them the task of looking after this subject for years to come. So, the right people have been entrusted with the task in hand, which involves thousands of librarians and represents Italy in the international context.

2. THE SUBJECT IN FRBR

To approach the topic of a new *Soggettario* from a broad outlook, including the whole of cataloguing, according to the most advanced thought at international level, reference to the FRBR Report may be useful because, in examining the bibliographic record, it joins descriptive and semantic cataloguing together.¹⁰ The subject is analysed as a relation between the *entities in the third group: concept, object, event, place* and the entity *work*. Correctly, the relationships with neither expression nor manifestation are not posed, because the subject does not change in the various expressions and manifestations. The entities of the third group correspond to a simple categorisation according to the contraposition of abstract/concrete and according to time and space determiners. To these are added the entities of the first group (work, expression, manifestation, item) and second group (person, corporate body), which may act as the subject of a work. Thus a variety of subject categories appear but are not, nor are intended to be, exhaustive. For example, the entity "living organism" does not appear and neither do the entities "person" or "corporate body," except where they act as responsables (second group).

FRBR does not perform an analysis of cataloguing languages but rather defines a working model of the record. For this reason, the part dedicated to semantic indexing may appear rather poor compared to the innumerable cases and the complexity of cataloguing practice. The model presented in FRBR would be inadequate if we wanted to apply it to the semantic part of the record. In this sense, certain limitations of the model are highlighted:

1. subjects are presented as individual instances (3.1.3: <<*an abstract notion or idea*>>, <<*a material thing*>>, <<*an action or occurrence*>>, <<*a location*>>) and are exemplified as individual instances; the majority of real subjects are in any case generalisations or concepts representing a class of individuals; the typical subject is *churches* rather than *Santa Maria Novella*; nonetheless, both descriptors are possible;
2. subjects are presented as atomic units, without the articulation of further concepts which are found in most real subjects. In this isolation of the individual entity, semantics seem to be lost, the discourse in which any subject is necessarily collocated.
3. the analysis of attributes is lacking: it is limited to stating the term for the entity, without including elements which would be useful for the management of the functions which a subject must perform (e.g., dates or designations which would help qualify it).

The FRBR Report has different objectives compared to the proposed renewal of the *Soggettario* because it presents an abstract model of the record, focused and constructed on the research requirements of the user (user tasks). The application of the E-R model (Entity-Relationship model) can, however, be used to analyse the working of the structure of the subject.

3. THE SUBJECT ACCORDING TO ENTITIES AND RELATIONSHIPS

The subject belongs to the real world as a conceptual representation of the indexer, which represents the contents of the work in a summarised and formalised way. The subject is not an entity present in the work and extracted from it, nor is it a preconstructed entity which exists in its own right. It exists as a conceptual nucleus of information created in order to mediate between the theme developed in the work and the universe of cultural and informational discourses which originate the requests for bibliographical enquiries. It is a logical entity which persists through the various relationships with diverse works, independent of the expressions and manifestations in which they occur, and allows us to recognise and relate the works which present the same basic theme and to distinguish them from those which develop different themes.

We can try an extension of the analysis of subjects according to the Entity-Relationship model applied to the product of indexing activity.

An indexing language has component elements which may be identified as logical elements. To construct a model, we first identify the logical

entities, then the attributes and relationships which run between the entities.

3.1 Entities

The logical entities are:

- a. the *subject*: the topic, the basic theme of the work, the summarisation of its main contents;
- b. the *concept*: a unit of thought, each of the single elements which make up the subject.

To develop the model we should better distinguish the entity *concept* (accepted in the wider sense, different from that of FRBR 3.2.7, <<Concept: an abstract notion or an idea>>¹¹ more specifically in the entities *concept* that represent the categories of concepts which can be traced in the formulation of a subject. We suggest a list of examples of these entities:

- concept of object (material thing)
- concept of abstraction
- concept of living organism
- concept of person
- concept of corporate body
- concept of work
- concept of matter/material
- concept of property/quality
- concept of action
- concept of process
- concept of event
- concept of place
- concept of time

The articulation of the entities on two levels (subject and concept) and according to categories of concepts allows us to highlight the summary themes of the works and the recurring concepts, as well as the relationships which run between them.

3.2 Attributes

The attributes of the entities considered are the following:

- a. attribute of the subject is

verbal designation,

the value of the attribute is the *subject heading string*.

Further attributes may be set for the functions of the *authority file* (e.g., identification codes, sources used for the conceptual processing, reference language).

- b. the attributes in common for the various conceptual entities are:

term for the concept,

the value of the attribute is the *preferred term*; other terms may also be handled as *variant terms*;

qualification of the concept,

the value of the attribute is the *formal qualifier*.

Other attributes are recognizable for the entities *concept* of particular categories, for example, dates as attributes of the entities *concept* of person, body, event.

Defining the attributes allows us to characterise and identify the single instances of the entity through the values of their attributes.

3.3 Relationships

Three groups of relationships are recognizable among the entities:

- a. *primary relationships*: between the subject and the concepts which compose it;
- b. *intra-subject relationships*: between concepts which compose the same subject;
- c. *extra-subject relationships*: between concepts independently of the subject in which they are used.

3.3.1 The primary relationships run between *subject* and *concept*. The *subject* is in a partitive relationship of the type <<has as a component>> with the *concepts* contained within it (relationship 1 to *n*). Reciprocally, the *concept* is in a partitive relationship of the type <<is a component of>> with the *subjects* of which it is a nuclear element (relationship 1 to *n*). Example of subject entity:

Dogs–Training

This subject has two entities concepts: *Dogs* is a concept of organism, *Training* is a concept of action. Between the subject and each concept there are thus relationships of a partitive nature: the concept *Dogs* is a

component of the subject Dogs–Training, likewise the concept Training; the subject Dogs–Training is composed of the two concepts, Dogs and Training. The body of primary relationships of the concept entity brings together and expresses all the instances of the concept in the context of the various subjects.

3.3.2 A second group of relationships operates between the *concepts* which make up the same *subject*. They have different relationships among them according to the logical roles assumed by each concept in the context of the subject. We present a non-exhaustive list of these intra-subject relations, expressed with a preference for the passive voice (where not listed, the reciprocal action can also be imagined). The concept

acts in an intransitive way . . .	the action . . . is performed by . . .
. . . undergoes the action . . .	the action . . . is directed at . . .
. . . is an instrument of intransitive action is performed by means of . . .
. . . is an instrument of transitive action is performed by means of . . .
. . . is the cause of an intransitive action is caused by . . .
. . . is the cause of a transitive action is caused by . . .
. . . is the beneficiary/receiver of is destined for . . .
. . . is responsible for is the responsibility of . . .
. . . is used in/for . . .	
. . . is compared with . . .	
. . . is location of is located in . . .
. . . is collocated in time in is a periodization of . . .

A direct relationship between all the component concepts does not necessarily exist, indeed, a chain of concepts is often established in which each one (excluding the first and the last) is related to the two logically contiguous concepts; the relationships with the others are mediated by logically interposed concepts. The sequence of relationships, however, is not always linear: the concepts of intransitive action are typically related simultaneously with an agent, an object, an instrument. Let us examine some examples of intra-subject relationships:

- a. in the subject *Cattle–Feeding*, the concept of organism Cattle undergoes the concept of action Feeding, while reciprocally the concept of transitive action Feeding is directed to the concept of organism Cattle;
- b. in the subject *Swallows–Migration*, the concept of organism Swallows acts in the intransitive action Migration; reciprocally, the intransitive concept of action Migration is performed by the concept of organism Swallows;
- c. in the subject *Italian Language–Study and teaching–Audio-visual aids*, the concept Italian Language undergoes the action Study and teaching; the concept Audio-visual aids is an instrument of the transitive action Study and teaching; there is no direct relationship between Italian Language and Audio-visual aids, only where mediated by Study and teaching;
- d. in the subject *Asbestos pollution–Control*, the concept of material Asbestos is the cause of the transitive action Pollution; the concept of action Pollution undergoes the action Control; there is no direct relationship between Asbestos and Control, only where mediated by Pollution;

It can be seen, incidentally, in the last example, that the concept term does not always necessarily coincide with a segment of the traditional strings: in the main heading two distinct concept entities are associated: Pollution and Asbestos.

The last four intra-subject relationships in the list above <<is location of>>, <<is located in>>, <<is collocated in time in>> and <<is a periodization of>> are typical of the last two concept entities on the previous list (Place and Time), which are usually related to the body of other concepts, that is, to all the rest of the subject heading, and not to a single concept. In the example *Cattle–Feeding–Tuscany*, the concept of place Tuscany is the location of the combination Cattle–Feeding, rather than of the single contiguous concept Feeding.

The intra-subject relationships specify the various logical roles assumed by the concept and demonstrate their occurrence in the same role in the various subjects.

3.3.3 The extra-subject relationships are relationships between entities *concept* which are not simultaneously present in a subject heading and thus are not linked to logical roles performed in the context of the entity *subject*; they are, however, sustained by significant relationships independent of the subject in which each concept can be a component. They are:

- a. *generic hierarchical relationships*, between one concept and another more specific one, and vice versa;
- b. *partitive hierarchical relationships*, between one concept and another recognizable as one of its parts, organs or components, and vice versa;
- c. *antonymous relationships*, between one concept and another of opposite meaning;
- d. *associative relationships*, between entities belonging to the same level of a hierarchy, and between entities from different categories when typical logical links exist: an action and its typical agent, an object and its institutional producer, an instrument and its function, a discipline and the subject matter it studies.

The extra-subject relationships collocate the concept in the context of meanings and knowledge to which it belongs, in which it is normally considered and sought. The fact that these relationships are established via concepts outside the subject does not mean that they have no relation with or are not detectable in the work that the subject refers to. It is typical of all discourse to consider together the genus and its species, the whole and its parts, opposites, antonyms and synonyms. Establishing these relationships means restoring the richness of contents of the work which the concise and summary formulation of the subject necessarily limits. The first two groups of relationships regard the syntax and the construction of the strings, the third regards the semantics and the syndetic network.

Other relationships could be established between subjects from different works which demonstrate different kinds of affinity or degree of specificity, or a partial overlap, or in any case a significant reason for reference. However, it seems more accurate and functional for these links to be created in the sequence of relationships described above: of the first type where a concept in common exists, of the first and third type where no concepts in common exist. For example, it is not necessary, or useful, to have a direct relationship between:

Beef cattle – Breeding – Maremma and *Cattle – Feeding – Tuscany*

The indirect relationship via a series of nodes is enough:

Beef cattle – Breeding – Maremma > has a component > *Buffalo*
Beef cattle > is a species of > *Cattle*
Cattle > is a component of > *Cattle – Feeding – Tuscany*

If required, the less interesting series is possible:

Beef cattle – Breeding – Maremma > has as a component > *Maremma*
Maremma > is part of > *Tuscany*
Tuscany > is a component of > *Cattle – Feeding – Tuscany*

The relationships between the formulations of one subject according to different indexing languages are more significant. It seems, however, more convenient for this type of equivalence or correspondence to be pointed out with special devices in support of the catalogue.

3.4 Functions

We can return to and amplify the user tasks of FRBR and indicate the following tasks which involve a subject:

1. *find* the works on a given subject;
2. *find* the works in which a concept is significantly treated or in which more than one subject is treated according to a significant relationship;
3. *select* a work by its main subject only;
4. *lead* to a search for works on related subjects;
5. *lead* to a search for works in which related or connected subjects are handled.

We evaluate the importance of attributes and relationships according to the functions identified and we indicate what data are essential to satisfy them.

- a. the attribute *verbal formulation* is essential for functions 1, 3 and 4;
- b. the attributes *term for the concept* and *qualification of the concept* are essential for functions 2, 4 and 5;
- c. the *primary relationships* are essential for functions 2 and 5;
- d. the *intra-subject relationships* are essential for functions 2 and 5;
- e. the *extra-subject relationships* are essential for functions 4 and 5.

These functions run parallel, because of the relationship between subject and work, with the functions typical of semiotic research, focused on the entities of groups one and two of FRBR and their relationships. Thus the unity of the record and the catalogue are reformed, the complex overall

nature of the network of relationships is made fully available via selectable maps and routes. For example, a personal or corporate entity can relate distinctly to a work as the author or creator, as a subject component, as the originator of an expression, as typographer or publisher of a manifestation, as owner or restorer of an item, and without causing confusion, can perform each of these functions with respect to different works, expressions, manifestations and items, because all the entities are linkable, but the types of relationships are distinct.

4. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This analysis clearly requires further refinement, verification and correction and does not indicate the means of construction and management of a new *Soggettario*. It can, however, suggest a direction for the research and some objectives. We can therefore supply further evaluation criteria for the choices which have to be made:

1. it is important to maintain the logical and operational distinction between the *subject* and the *concept*, giving value to both; the first for the exact representation of the contents of the work (coextensivity), the second for the connections of meanings which are both internal and external to the work, that is, the syntactical and semantic relationships of the individual concepts;
2. it is important to re-evaluate the “*non central*” *concepts*, not formally at the head of the string, given the opportunities they provide for diverse research. If their logical role and their association with other concepts are highlighted by the intra-subject relationships, research becomes possible aiming at something intermediate between the difficult precision of the co-extensive subject and the too easy occurrence of the isolated key word;
3. the analysis does not give prominence to the *citation order*, a classic and current theme of indexing, essential for the classification and the correct ordering of a catalogue, as well as for its coherence and the easy readability of a string. This consequence derives directly from the application to the subject of the entity-relationships model. To produce a citation order we have to identify the facets, while in the model it is the relationships which guide the logical succession of the concepts. This prevents us from setting a stable and general-

- ised citation order, but not from providing criteria for stating the citation order according to the various combinations of relationships;
4. in this application of the model, the distinction, traditional to subjecting in Italy as for the Library of Congress, between headings and *subdivisions*, disappears in favour of a network of relationships between concepts in which the precedents are not preconstituted. This does not mean repudiating the traditional distinction, but reconsidering it as one of the possible criteria for the sequential ordering of the concepts in the subject, of the terms in the string, to be compared with other criteria, for example, those based on categories or logical roles and relationships.

5. APPLICATION PRINCIPLES, MORPHOLOGY AND SEMANTICS

In this analysis there is no reference to application principles, criteria and methods which guide the document analysis and the subject representation, because the indexing policy is another set of problems. However, the point of view taken by FRBR induces at least one consideration: works and not manifestations should be considered. It follows that the summarization and the exhaustivity, as alternative choices among the reduction to the basic theme and the representation of all the subjects, are applied singly to the works contained in the item, and not to the manifestation which contains them, as prevails in the current practice when a publication collects more than one work.

We have not discussed morphology here; the criteria of morphological choice belong to the means to be used for the effective application of the model. We can easily infer a consideration: the preference for factoring into single terms compared to the use of composite formulations, which diminishes the criteria of linguistic use. The semantic aspect also remains overshadowed because we start from the work as the original data, while semantics is *a priori* and most widely comprehensive of each work. And yet it cannot fail to appear, because it is the necessary base to formalize our thought. Indeed, with the relationships of the third order (extra-subject) the syndetic network is recreated, and supplies the orientation and favours the correcting and carrying on of research along personalized lines. Morphology and semantics should be developed in tandem, for example in a controlled vocabulary.

In the light of the foregoing, the proposals contained in the feasibility study presented by Ifnet seem to be compatible with the overall approach

resulting from this study conducted according to the E-R model assumed as the base for FRBR. The proposals thus enjoy the value of prospect secured by the insertion in the most recent line of research in the international field. Programmatically, the FRBR Report avoids specifying particular cataloguing solutions, and even the analysis presented here does not aim at operational solutions. In any case, the procedure adopted, turning on abstraction and the search for logical connections, offers a final picture which is very detailed and mobile on account of its plurality and variability of relationships highlighted and it demonstrates a greater affinity with systems based on logical analysis and synthesis techniques, rather than with systems based on lists of preconstituted headings, even if they are also enriched by a network of links and instructions which make them more complete and functional.

Received: March, 2002

Accepted: March, 2002

NOTES

1. The text of the proposal is not published; for a report of the seminar cfr. Anna Lucarelli, *La Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Firenze e il rinnovamento dell'indicizzazione per soggetto*, p. 307-314. Massimo Rolle, *Per un nuovo modello di linguaggio documentario*, p. 315-326, in <<Bollettino AIB>>, vol. 41, n. 3 (2001). In the same issue is an Italian version of this article, p. 327-336

2. The National Central Library, Florence began inserting the subject heading in the records of the <<Bollettino delle pubblicazioni italiane ricevute per diritto di stampa>> in 1925. From this experience and the study of Library of Congress subject headings and other lists of subject headings which make use of expressions from natural language, in 1936 the librarians of the National Library began developing, with several interruptions due to the events of the war, a controlled dictionary of terms which was published in 1956. The <<Bibliografia nazionale italiana>>, from 1958 onwards, has edited the publication of five updated lists in 1977, 1982, 1988, 1997 and 1999.

3. Luigi Crocetti, Diego Maltese, *Per una nuova edizione del Soggettario*, in: <<Bollettino d'informazioni/Associazione italiana biblioteche>>, a. 5, n. 4 (1965), p. 163.

4. *La documentazione in azienda*, Roma, 1966, vol. 2, p. 235-356.

5. Emanuele Casamassima, *La soggettazione*, in: *Manuale del catalogatore*, a cura della Bibliografia nazionale italiana, Firenze: Centro nazionale per il catalogo unico delle biblioteche italiane e per le informazioni bibliografiche, 1970, p. [229]-245.

6. Diego Maltese, *Regole per il <<Soggettario>>: un progetto non finito*, in <<L'indicizzazione>>, a. 3, n. 2 (1988), p. 7-15. The reference is to the celebrated Seymour Lubetzky, *Code of cataloging rules. Author and title entry: an unfinished draft for a new edition of cataloging rules prepared for the Catalog Code Revision Committee*; with an explanatory commentary by Paul Dunkin, Chicago: ALA, 1960.

7. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, *Principles underlying subject heading languages (SHLs)*, edited by Maria Inês Lopes and Julianne Beall, Working group on Principles underlying subject heading languages, approved by the Standing committee of the IFLA section on classification and indexing, München: Saur, 1999. Cfr. *Subject indexing: principles and practices in the 90's. Proceedings of the IFLA satellite meeting held in Lisbon, Portugal, 17-18 August 1993*, and sponsored by the IFLA section on classification and indexing and the Instituto de la Biblioteca nacional e do livro, Lisbon, Portugal, edited by Robert P. Holley, Dorothy McGarry, Donna Duncan, Elaine Svenonius, München: Saur, 1995

8. Associazione italiana biblioteche, GRIS-Gruppo di ricerca sull'indicizzazione per soggetto, *Guida all'indicizzazione per soggetto*, Roma, Associazione italiana biblioteche, 1996.

9. Cfr. Diego Maltese, Alberto Petrucciani, *Un'esperienza di indicizzazione per soggetto. Materiali per la versione italiana del PRECIS [An experience of subject indexing. Materials for an Italian version of PRECIS]*, Roma, Associazione italiana biblioteche, 1990.

10. *Functional requirements for bibliographic records. Final report*, IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, approved by the Standing Committee of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing, München: Saur, 1998. Cfr. Carlo Ghilli, Mauro Guerrini, *Introduzione a FRBR. Functional requirements for bibliographic records. Requisiti funzionali per record bibliografici*, Milano: Editrice bibliografica, c2001. For a critical reading in various directions cfr. *Seminario FRBR. Functional requirements for bibliographic records. Requisiti funzionali per record bibliografici, Florence, 27-28 January 2000. Atti, a cura di Mauro Guerrini. FRBR Seminar. Functional requirements for bibliographic records. Requisiti funzionali per record bibliografici, Florence, 27th-28th January 2000. Proceedings*, edited by Mauro Guerrini, Roma: Associazione italiana biblioteche, 2000. Tête bêche Italian and English. Rather interesting is Caterina Fasella, *IFLA Functional requirements for bibliographic records: problemi di applicazione e metadati [problems of application and metadata]*, in <<Bollettino AIB>>, vol. 40, n. 4 (2000), p. [471]-487.

11. The point proceeds: <<The entity defined as concept encompasses a comprehensive range of abstractions that may be the subject of a *work*: fields of knowledge, disciplines, schools of thought (philosophies, religions, political ideologies, etc.), theories, processes, techniques, practices, etc. A *concept* may be broad in nature or narrowly defined and precise>>.