

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Dave Reser, LC Representative  
**Subject:** Add instructions to supply terms indicating the function recorded under the optional addition provisions at 2.7.4.4, 2.8.4.4, 2.9.4.4 or 2.10.4.4, in a language and script preferred by the cataloguing agency

Although LC is willing to support this proposal, we want to assure that the decision is made in the proper context of current RDA instructions. We have outlined some other considerations, and provided an analysis of this issue in ISBD and AACR2 as background.

### **Applying RDA 1.4**

The sub-elements in 2.7-2.10 covered in the proposal are listed in 1.4, where there are general transcription instructions and information about the language and script to use when 1) adding data within an element (the subject of the CCC proposal), and 2) when supplying an element:

When adding data within an element listed at 1.4, record the added data in the language and script of the other data in the element unless the instructions for a specific element indicate otherwise.

When information is supplied in an element listed at 1.4, record the supplied information in the most appropriate language and script.

The difference between the first and second “when” sentences is that in the situation described in the first sentence, **some** data for the element is in the source of information, but in the second sentence, **no** data for the element is present in the source but it can be supplied. The following examples demonstrate the application of each “when” instruction:

#### **Adding data within an element**

If a place of publication says “Den Haag” on the resource, the cataloger could apply the 2nd Optional Addition at 2.8.2.3 to record the place of publication as “Den Haag [Nederland]” by supplying the name of the larger place in the same language as that of the smaller place.

#### **Information supplied in an element**

If the publisher’s name is found on the resource as “Boston University Press” but no place of publication is found, a cataloger could apply 2.8.2.6.1 to supply “[Boston]” as the place of publication.

Although CCC asserted that there is a gap in existing RDA instructions that impeded the translation teams' review of examples in the Optional Addition at 2.7.4.4, etc., the explicit instructions about what language and script to use when supplying data within an element are clear. The same instructions in 1.4 would apply to data supplied at 2.4.1.7 (clarification of role), 2.5.2.3 (adding an appropriate word to an edition statement), or the 2nd Optional Addition at 2.8.2.3 (supplying a larger place). Since the instruction at 1.4 allows itself to be 'overruled' by other instructions that indicate otherwise, we do believe that the CCC proposal for 2.7.4.4, etc., could specify that the preferred language and script of the agency be used (although we could find no current instructions that "indicate otherwise").

The CCC proposal indicates that 2.4.1.5, Optional Omission set a precedent for *adding* a term in the language of the agency. In the case of 2.7.4.4, data is being *supplied within* a sub-element. In the case of 2.4.1.5, data is being *omitted within* an element, and the content of the omission is being *summarized*. We admit that there is a fine difference between summarizing omitted data within an element and adding data within an element. Does the JSC agree that the language instructions at 2.4.1.5, Optional Omission are present because the situation is not addressed in 1.4?

## **Other Considerations Raised**

### **1) The Necessity of the Optional Addition**

When reviewing CCC's proposal, we wondered about the necessity of an Optional Addition for 2.7.4.4, 2.8.4.4., 2.9.4.4, and 2.10.4.4 at all. Because the function is already indicated by the element name, the Optional Addition seems redundant. These additions were necessary in MARC when different elements were recorded together in a 260 field thus:

260 ## \$a Thessaloniki : \$b CEDEFOP ; \$a Luxembourg : \$b Office for Official Publications of the European Communities [distributor], \$c 1999.

Without "[distributor]" a user would be unable to determine whether "Office for Official Publications of the European Communities" was a publisher or a distributor. However, now we can use repeatable 264 fields with indicators specifying the element (1 for publisher and 2 for distributor):

264 #1 \$a Thessaloniki : \$b CEDEFOP, \$c 1999.

264 #2 \$a Luxembourg : \$b Office for Official Publications of the European Communities [distributor], \$c [1999]

Because the indicators are specific to an element, a library could generate display constants from them so that OPAC users would see labels like this (or something similar):

**Publication information:** Thessaloniki : CEDEFOP, 1999.

**Distribution information:** Luxembourg : Office for Official Publications of the European Communities [distributor], [1999]

This added statement of function seems unnecessary for any implementation of RDA except a card catalog implementation. We would not suggest altering the instructions when these statements of function are *found* on the resource because they assist in identification of the manifestation when transcribed. A note could always be made to remove any doubt about the information recorded. However, in consideration of previous discussions on the desire to simplify 2.7-2.10, we ask if the JSC wishes to consider deleting the optional additions for statement of function in 2.7-2.10 at this time?

## 2) A General Alternative at 1.4

The arguments made by CCC about catalogers being unable to determine statements of function equivalents in all languages could be applied to multiple elements of RDA. We could also make the argument that it would be more efficient for a U.S. cataloger to supply the larger place of publication in English rather than needing to match the language of the smaller place (e.g., “Den Haag [Netherlands]” instead of “Den Haag [Nederland]”). Therefore, we ask if an alternative to 1.4 would be easier to implement and more useful for agencies rather than adding to each element language and script instructions for supplying data within the element? There could be two alternatives—1) language and script for supplying the element and 2) language and script for applying data within the element. Two alternatives give agencies the most flexibility in implementing RDA and applying both would alleviate potential confusion about what language and script to use for supplied data in transcribed elements.

## 3) Return to Pre-rewording Paragraph in 1.4

We note that the paragraph in 1.4 for supplying an element (rather than supplying data in an element) is perhaps less clear than in the pre-reworded version.

Current:

When information **is supplied in** an element listed at 1.4, record the supplied information in the most appropriate language and script.

Pre-rewording:

When recording an element listed above **as a supplied element**, record the supplied element in the most appropriate language and script.

LC would be willing to forward a fast track revision if there is agreement to revert to some form of the earlier wording, such as:

When supplying an element listed in 1.4, record the supplied element in the most appropriate language and script.

### **BACKGROUND: ISBD and AACR2 Approaches**

In ISBD, interpolations in areas 1,2,3,4, and 6 are given in the language and script appropriate to the other data that appears except for two situations:

- 1) prescribed abbreviations and interpolations
- 2) statement of function of distributor and additions to the date of printing, both of which are given in the language and script of the cataloging agency.

In AACR2, the instructions were more complicated. 1.0E1 contained different instructions for the language and script of interpolations depending on the area of description. For these areas interpolations were given in the language and script of the other data in the area: title, statement of responsibility, edition, publication, distribution, etc., and series. However, 1.0E1 also contained a list of exceptions to that instruction, including “statements of function of the publisher, distributor, etc. (see 1.4E). Unlike the other exceptions listed at 1.0E1, 1.4E contained no instructions on the language and script in which to record this statement of function.

We think it is not desirable to use either ISBD or AACR2 as a model for instructions on supplying a statement of function for producer, publisher, distributor, and manufacturer. In both ISBD and AACR2, the data is treated very differently from RDA— ISBD/AACR2 allow corrected data in brackets preceded by “i.e.”; ISBD/AACR2 prescribe using Latin abbreviations when no place of publication or publisher’s name is recorded, etc.; ISBD/AACR2 allow the publisher’s name to be recorded in a shortened form, etc. Additionally for AACR2, having so many different language and script instructions for transcribed elements made the application of AACR2 more difficult for catalogers. We find the simplified and consistent RDA approach to language and script for supplying data within a transcribed element an improvement over AACR2.