

### 3.2.7. Summary of Mapping Issues

The issue of mapping Chinese and English role designators is more than a translation issue. We can see how different cultural regions represent creators and contributors differently. For instance, if a Chinese term can be interpreted as both editor and compiler, why is it so? Does that mean people do not distinguish the two roles, so the language allows and represents the ambiguity? On the contrary, if a Chinese term is very specific about a role that is difficult to find an English counterpart, does that mean the role is important enough to have a specific term created? The mapping issue surfaces a conflict between standard warrant and content and cultural warrant. Catalogers describing Chinese materials in the U.S. context may struggle between conforming with U.S. cataloging practices and standards, which risk losing meanings; and faithful descriptions, which require extra research and proposing new terms.

### 3.3. Rubbings

Rubbings are a special material form that challenge the FRBR WEMI model. Rubbings are a form created based on an original artwork, which could be a portrait or calligraphy created by an artist or a calligrapher. For long term preservation, the owner of the artwork hired an engraver to carve a representation of it on a stele, hoping the transformation of medium would extend the longevity of the artwork. However, steles were often placed outdoors and they decayed over time. To further preserve the artwork, people may ask a technician to create rubbings from a stele – by attaching a paper to the stele and padding inks to the paper, the content of the stele could be transferred and preserved through the rubbing. People could create multiple rubbings from the same stele at different times. There is no guarantee that the conditions of the stele remained identical when the rubbings were created.

In an observation session, Q showed me her explanation and application of the FRBR WEMI model. The original artwork (2D), the stele (3D), and the rubbing (2D) are treated as three related *Works*. The creators (artist/calligrapher, engraver, technician) and creation dates of the *Works* are different. Therefore, when cataloging a rubbing, Q would record the creation date of the rubbing and the name of the technician, if applicable, as the creator. However, Z does not agree with this approach. In an observation session with Z, he elaborated on his rationale of cataloging rubbings as one work, and provided some cultural context. From Z's perspective, users only access the rubbing because they cannot access the original artwork or the stele. The original work may no longer exist, and the stele may be preserved at a museum. The rubbing is a reproduction of the original artwork. When cataloging rubbings, Z would record the artist/calligrapher and creation date of the original artwork, because that is what users care about. Z told me that in pre-modern China, engravers and technicians are mechanics. They were not considered creators of artworks. Hence, most of their names were not documented. Z commented:

“How could it be helpful to users if we use RDA to catalog, and they see all these information [pointing at the author and publication information (creation date) fields] as “unknown?” This way of cataloging [RDA] cannot distinguish [rubbings]... “the original object is the critical element for identifying rubbings.”

To explain the WEMI model, Q used an example of herself taking a picture of the Mona Lisa painting at the Louvre. Da Vinci is the creator of the Mona Lisa painting, and Q is the creator of the photo. Z argues that Da Vinci should be the creator of both