

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Referential relationships: RDA Chapters 24-28 and Appendix J

While we appreciate the thought ALA has given to this complex issue, LC does not agree to this proposal. We believe that ALA's proposal is based on assumptions that we would not make about the level of entity relationship for rare book bibliographies and the working principles for constructing a citation form outlined in *Standard Citation Forms for Rare Materials Cataloging* (SCF). We suggest the citation forms used for these "referential relationships" are similar to existing elements in chapters 2 and 6, including identifiers and numeric designation of a musical work. However, because of the disparity in treatment of these elements in FRBR and FRAD, we suggest the JSC consider deferring this issue until after FR consolidation.

During our discussion of this proposal, the following concerns were raised:

- A) appropriate WEMI level for the references
- B) relationship or element/attribute
- C) re-purposing of Chapters 24-28
- D) developing negative-defined relationships in RDA.

Note: ALA's proposal says, "... the source being cited is identified by a standard abbreviation or a citation form as established and maintained by SCF." Its proposal implies that SCF citation forms are based on abbreviations and either bibliography numbers or location within the resource cited (e.g. a page number). While this was true of the previous edition of SCF, it is not true of the citation form as described in the current SCF. So the citation previously given as "Wing (2nd ed., 1994) A3695" is now given as: "Wing, D.G. Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English books printed in other countries, 1641-1700 (2nd ed. 1994) , entry A3695." We realize ALA may not have had the latest version of SCF at the time of its proposal writing.

A. Appropriate WEMI Level for the References

1. The citation forms in SCF use manifestation elements and a creator relationship.

ALA states that "expressions are generally the fundamental unit of reference in SCF." We do not believe that this is accurate. Except for using a shortened form of the author's preferred name in the bibliographic entry, which is a relationship between a work and its creator, the other parts of the bibliographic entry are composed of manifestation elements

including: title proper, edition statement, publication date, and sometimes other title information.

The Introduction to SCF states that the citation form uses the "full title proper" and using a title "how the work is popularly known" was rejected. As expressions have no titles, a citation form that uses any kind of title cannot be using attributes of the expression. The Working Principles of the SCF instruct using a parenthetical qualifier in the citation form to distinguish between editions. We believe that this may be the source of ALA's assumption about expressions, as a revision to an existing work is usually considered an expression of the work. However, an edition statement is a manifestation attribute and STC says to provide "edition information as it appears on the bibliographic record for the resource being cited" for numbered or dated editions statements. For "editions" that are not numbered or dated, SCF says to use the publication date with the term "edition"—this is equivalent to a supplied edition statement, which is an Optional Addition in RDA 2.5.1.4.

For unnumbered bibliographies, STC says to provide the designation of volume, page, etc. for the location of the citation—these are units of extent. Extent is an attribute of manifestation. While it is debatable whether a citation number in a numbered bibliography is part of the expression of that bibliography or its manifestation expressed, it seems illogical to treat numbered bibliographies as expression-to-manifestation relationships and unnumbered bibliographies as manifestation-to-manifestation relationships.

There are numerous bibliographies and catalogs that describe resources in numerous ways. The bibliographies that are referenced in ALA's proposal describe particular manifestations of works. "Wing A3695" contains the following information:

- 1) a shortened form of the title proper (*Aristotle's Rhetoric*)
- 2) a shortened form of publication statement, (By T.B. for Randal Taylor, 1686)¹
- 3) book format (8o)
- 4) holdings information.

Wing does provide the creator of the work since all the manifestations of works by Aristotle within the scope of Wing's bibliography are listed under **Aristotle**. However, there is no information in Wing that provides attributes of expression such as language of expression or expression-level relationships such as translators. Although we have only discussed the information found in a Wing citation, we know that citations found in other

¹ Wing is inconsistent in providing place of publication. However, the bibliography is limited in scope to books printed between 1641-1700 in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and English books printed in other countries.

popular sources listed in the SCF are similar, including those found in ESTC, VD 16, Hain, and GW.

2. Existing RDA structure.

We believe that a numeric designation of a musical work represents a "referential relationship" as described by ALA. A thematic index number is a number used to identify a work of a particular composer. For example, BWV 7 is the thematic index number for Johann Sebastian Bach's cantata *Christ unser Herr zum Jordan kam*. *Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis* (BWV) assigns a number to works of Bach that can be used for identification. We suggest that thematic index numbers are to musical works what bibliograph numbers are to manifestations of rare books.

A thematic index number for a composer is also be analogous to numbers assigned to individual poems of an author by an editor, scholar, etc. For example, "Fr. 479" or "Franklin 479" is the number assigned by R.W. Franklin to the Emily Dickinson poem often known by its first line, "Because I could not stop for Death." That same poem is also known as "J. 712" or "Johnson 712" using the numbering of Thomas H. Johnson. Sappho and Alcaeus are examples of other literary authors whose works are often referred to by an abbreviation for the bibliographer or editor and a number.

Although we are unaware of any citation numbers that refer purely to expressions of works (e.g., 1075 for all French translations of Shakespeare's Hamlet), we would not be surprised to learn such things exist.

The current RDA definition for identifier for a work is "a character string uniquely associated with a work, or with a surrogate for a work (e.g., an authority record). The identifier serves to differentiate that work from other works." The Franklin and Johnson numbers for Dickinson's poems described above meet that definition, as do thematic index numbers such as BWV 771. This is consistent with FRAD's definition of an identifier which says identifiers include thematic index numbers and catalogue raisonné numbers (see more discussion of this issue in Relationship or Element/Attribute).

B. Relationship or Element/Attribute

ALA's proposal states that it considered the issue of whether references to published descriptions should be handled as an element in Chapter 2 or a relationship. ALA says they rejected the idea of treating these references as elements because they would represent "hidden relationships" as discussed in 6JSC/DNB/Discussion/3.

As CCC noted in its response to 6JSC/DNB/Discussion/3, "the distinction between an attribute and a relationship is entirely artificial."

FRBR notes that the identifier for a manifestation may be a number assigned to it by an international standards organization, a publisher or a bibliographer or musicologist, etc. (see FRBR 4.4.14). Thus, Donald Wing's number A3695 for the 1686 publication "by T.B. for Randal Taylor" of Aristotle's Rhetoric meets the FRBR definition for identifier for a manifestation. Although it is not explicitly stated in RDA, a bibliographic citation number such as A3695 can also meet the RDA definition of an identifier for the manifestation.

We note that Chapter 6 already contains a form of what ALA calls a "referential relationship"—Numeric Designation of a Musical Work. (See discussion on this issue in Existing RDA Structure).

One reason citation numbers may be used is to justify supplying elements for a manifestation. For example, a note on publication statement (RDA 2.17.17) might read, "Date of publication from Adams." Then a note with a standard citation form would also be provided like this one: "Adams, H.M. Catalogue of books printed on the continent of Europe, 1501-1600, in Cambridge libraries, entry A-100." So we believe these citations already pair well with existing chapter 2 note elements.

Chapters 2 and 6 already contain "hidden relationships" by treating identifiers as attributes instead of relationships. FRBR and FRAD treat identifiers differently (in FRAD an identifier is an entity and in FRBR an identifier is an attribute). Because of this, we think the JSC may wish to consider deferring issues raised in ALA/45 until FR consolidation. Several constituent responses to 6JSC/DNB/Discussion/3 indicated a desire to defer the "attribute vs. relationship" issue until FR consolidation.

C. Repurposing of Chapters 24-28

We share ALA's concern about the inability to express relationships other than primary or subject relationships across WEMI levels (aka "cross-entity relationships"). However, since ALA/41 advocates for adherence to the work-to-work and expression-to-expression relationships described in the existing chapters, we do not see how both ALA/45 and ALA/41 can be approved by the JSC in their current forms. Furthermore, we note that neither proposal reflects the approach that was agreed upon for these chapters at the 2013 JSC meeting (see our response to 6JSC/ALA/41 for further information) and this proposal does not align with recommendations in 6JSC/TechnicalWG/6. We believe a JSC discussion about the direction of relationships between Group 1 entities is needed before further development of these chapters can occur. Also, as the issue of "cross-

entity relationships" is much broader than this one relationship type, an analysis from the TechnicalWG is needed.

We also wonder about the potential confusion to current RDA users if the nature of Chapters 24-28 were to change as ALA proposes. It seems to create a conflict with the existing Chapter 17. Since a primary relationship is a type of "cross-entity relationship," should Chapter 17 be deprecated in favor of a cross-entity model in Chapters 24-28? Again, we feel this is a large issue that should be addressed by the TechnicalWG before piecemeal changes are made.

D. Developing Negatively-Defined Relationships in RDA

Currently, 5.8 and 8.12 contain instructions for providing sources not found for works and expressions and group 2 entities. The last paragraph of 5.8 says, "Cite other sources that were consulted but provided no useful information for establishing the preferred title. Record *No information found* following the citation for the source consulted." We believe that this is the extent to which references to a lack of information need to be developed in RDA.

Conclusion

We believe there are two approaches to these referential relationships that would be an improvement on this proposal:

- 1) add elements to Chapters 2 and 6
- 2) limit the relationships so that they are not reciprocal at all levels.

We have already discussed the elements approach because we believe it is the best approach. However, we think an approach that does not make relationships at all levels could be done although it would be much more difficult. This would be similar to the current work subject relationships (all WEMI entities can be the subject of a work, but only works can have subjects). It would limit the application to all WEMI entities being referenced in a manifestation but only manifestations can have references.