To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

From: Edith Röschlau, DNB Representative

Subject: Discussion paper: Mixture of work level and manifestation level in RDA 2.3.2.6 (Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents), Optional Additions

1. Background

The German cataloguing community has struggled to reach a precise understanding of the two optional additions in RDA 2.3.2.6 (Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents). Although the rule has become clearer in presentation due to the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing's 2013 proposal (6JSC/CCC/11), the text is essentially unchanged, and we still find the optional additions problematic. The present discussion paper proposes a review and clarification.

The paper first gives an overview of RDA 2.3.2.6 (see section 2), and then explains the conceptual problems connected to the optional additions (see section 3). The paper also makes some tentative suggestions as to how these problems might be resolved (see section 4), and puts them in a broader context (see section 5). Finally, two questions are posed to the JSC (see section 6).

2. Overview of RDA 2.3.2.6

RDA 2.3.2.6 gives guidance in a situation where a source of information shows titles proper on two levels in a whole/part relationship, e.g. the title proper of a collection of stories and the titles proper of the individual stories, or the title proper of a series and the title proper of an individual volume in this series. According to which type of description is chosen (comprehensive or analytical), 2.3.2.6 prescribes the cataloger which of the titles found on the resource is to be chosen as the title proper of the manifestation described. The optional additions then give guidance how to handle the title(s) on the source of information not chosen as the title proper of the manifestation described.

The optional addition at 2.3.2.6.1 (Comprehensive Description) reads as follows:

> *Optional Addition*
>
> Record the titles of the individual contents as titles of related works (see 25.1 RDA).

The optional addition at 2.3.2.6.2 (Analytical Description) reads as follows:

> *Optional Addition*
>
> Record the collective title for the larger resource as the title of a related work (see
> 25.1 RDA)

3. Conceptual problems with the optional additions

The present phrasing of the optional additions poses two difficulties, which will be explained below.

3.1 Manifestation titles as titles of works

The first difficulty is connected to the wording "as titles of related works" and "as the title of a related work" in the optional additions. We would like to point out that 2.3.2.6 is about the level of the manifestation, and not about the level of the work. Although the titles found in the source of information belong to different levels in a whole/part relationship, there can be no doubt that all of them are situated on the level of the manifestation. So it is hard to see how some of them could be recorded as titles of works.

This can be illustrated by the following example: The resource being catalogued is a German translation of David Lodge's "Campus trilogy", including the three novels "Changing places", "Small world", and "Nice work". The preferred source of information looks like this:

> David Lodge
>
> DIE CAMPUS-TRILOGIE
>
> Ortswechsel
>
> Kleine Welt
>
> Saubere Arbeit

If we choose a comprehensive description, 2.3.2.6.1 prescribes us to record the collective title, i.e. "Die Campus-Trilogie" as the title proper. The optional addition then advises us to record the titles which were not chosen as the title proper, i.e. "Ortswechsel", "Kleine Welt", and "Saubere Arbeit", as titles of related works. But the titles of the individual works certainly aren't the German translation titles found on the manifestation. Rather, they would be the original English titles of the novels, i.e. "Changing places", "Small world", and "Nice work".

3.2 Possible ways of recording the title(s) according to 25.1

The second problem is the reference to 25.1 in the optional additions. We agree that there is a relationship on the work level between the larger work and the individual work(s) in the cases treated in 2.3.2.6. But 25.1 is about the recording of such a relationship, and not about the recording of titles.

There are three possible ways of recording a relationship to a related work, as illustrated in 25.1.1.3. The first option is to use an identifier for the work. Recording an identifier is certainly not the same as recording a title. So, it is difficult to see how this could be relevant for the recording of the titles "Ortswechsel", "Kleine Welt", and "Saubere Arbeit", which were found on the source of information.

The second option is to record an authorized access point representing the related work. In the example, we could record the following authorized access points, with an appropriate relationship designator:

> Container of (work): David Lodge, 1935-. Changing places
>
> Container of (work): David Lodge, 1935-. Small world
>
> Container of (work): David Lodge, 1935-. Nice work

Again, this is not the same as recording a title, but at least it includes a title, and the titles recorded in the authorized access points are indeed the preferred titles of the works. However, they are certainly not identical to the titles which were found on the source of information.

The third option is giving a structured description for the related works. In the example, we could record:

> Contains: Ortswechsel – Kleine Welt – Saubere Arbeit

This is the only case where we actually record the titles found on the source of information, because structured descriptions of this kind (i.e. contents notes in MARC 505) are traditionally based on the manifestation. But these titles are not the "titles of the related works" (these would be the English titles). So again, we end up with a contradiction.

4. Possible strategies

Having analyzed the problems with the optional additions, we would like to present some ideas as to how the problems could be resolved. We do not yet present an elaborated proposal, because we believe that the general strategy must be decided upon first, before the details can be worked out.

4.1 Option 1

One possibility would be to leave out the word "titles" in the optional additions altogether, e.g. like this: "Record the works contained as related works (see 25.1)" (in 2.3.2.6.1) and "Record the larger work as a related work (see 25.1)" (in 2.3.2.6.2).

The optional additions would then merely draw attention to the fact that the cases treated in 2.3.2.6 can also be seen under the aspect of related works. There would, however, no longer be any direct guidance about the recording of the manifestation titles not chosen as titles proper.

4.2 Option 2

Another possibility would be to rephrase the optional additions, e.g. like this: "Record the titles of the individual contents as titles proper of manifestations of related works" (in 2.3.2.6.1) and "Record the collective title for the larger work as the title proper of a manifestation of a related work" (in 2.3.2.6.2).

This would be conceptually correct. However, it is not quite clear how this could be done in practice. A reference to 25.1 would only help with recording the relationship between the works. A reference to chapter 27.1 (Related Manifestations) would not apply; the case does not fit in here.

There are, in effect, two different kinds of relationships which need to be taken into account and should both be reflected in our cataloguing: Firstly, there is the relationship between two related works, e.g. the collection as a whole and the individual novel. This is a whole/part relationship. In a first step, the relationship to the related work (either the whole or a part) needs to be recorded. Secondly, there is the primary relationship between this related work and one of its manifestations, as treated in 17.7 (Manifestation of Work). So, in a second step, we must go from the work level to the manifestation level, i.e. move within the FRBR tree of the related work. The titles found on the resource are, in fact, an attribute of this manifestation. This two-step relationship is a rather complex construct which is difficult to implement in a MARC environment.

5. RDA 2.3.2.6 in a broader context

As has been noted before, RDA does not always keep the WEMI levels strictly apart. Recently, ALA's discussion paper on "Instructions for Recording Relationships" (6JSC/ALA/Discussion/3) has highlighted the matter in the context of structured descriptions for related entities. As mentioned there (p. 2), the current examples in section 6 "routinely mix work, expression, and manifestation elements". We think that the optional additions in RDA 2.3.2.6 are also a case of a certain confusion between the WEMI levels.

6. Questions to the JSC

The German cataloguing community would like to pose the following questions:

a) Does the JSC agree with our analysis of the conceptual problems connected with the optional additions in RDA 2.3.2.6, as explained in chapter 3 of this discussion paper?

b) If so, how does the JSC assess the two possible strategies outlined in chapter 4 of this discussion paper? Could one of them lead to a solution to the conceptual problems or should an altogether different strategy be pursued?