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**Why the change?**

The short answer is that OLIS depends on being able to derive records from the British Library, the Library of Congress and other major cataloguing agencies. We also, as a major cataloguing agency, have a responsibility to make our own contribution to the pool of good-quality records available for other agencies to use. It is therefore impractical for us to be use different cataloguing standards from those used by the other major anglophone cataloguing agencies. Since BL, LC and many other agencies are implementing RDA on or about 31 March 2013, the most efficient course for us is to do the same.

But why are LC, BL, etc. moving to RDA? That needs a longer answer. RDA is promoted as offering the following advantages:

i) It uses FRBR\(^1\) principles to determine what information to include when cataloguing a resource and how best to organise it to allow catalogue users to work efficiently.

ii) It presents data in a neutral and granular way, not tied to a particular format such as MARC or a particular context such as libraries. In principle this makes it much easier for the data to be used by a wide range of people for a wide range of purposes. It also makes it easier for libraries to ‘harvest’ data from a wide range of sources, not just from other libraries, and thus to offer encyclopedic and integrated information going beyond that currently found in library catalogues. It enables library data to become part of the world of ‘linked’ and ‘open’ data, also known as the ‘semantic web’.

iii) It facilitates the development of non-MARC library systems which might be more friendly and intuitive for cataloguers.

iv) It does not favour books over other types of carrier and should be able to cope with new types of carrier as they arise.

v) It is less geared than AACR2 to Western World and anglophone interests and will probably be adopted by some major foreign-language cataloguing agencies.

vi) It is less prescriptive than AACR2, allowing a wide range of options for what to include and how to present it and leaving more to local agency decisions and cataloguer’s judgment. This might encourage agencies who require less detail and/or use less highly-trained staff, e.g. booksellers, to adopt it. Some of the options are designed to facilitate automated cataloguing by Optical Character Recognition.

Inevitably, there are downsides to these advantages. RDA is not structured to facilitate specific library cataloguing tasks, and it is much bigger than AACR2. Whereas AACR2 might be thought of as a kitchen cupboard holding just the ingredients that academic library cataloguers regularly use, RDA is more like a supermarket, with such a range of products that it can sometimes be a challenge to find the ones we want.

For this reason, the OLIS documentation for RDA is designed to be fairly free-standing and task-oriented, presenting the relevant RDA instructions in the context of the other standards we use, i.e. ISBD punctuation, MARC 21, and local OLIS policies. You will sometimes have to consult RDA itself on questions of fine detail, e.g. how to treat Romanian patronymics or Byzantine works with well-established

---

Latin titles (in which case a quick search will find the answer) or how to capitalise soil types (see Appendix A), or to find full lists of controlled vocabularies, e.g. carrier types for 300 $a; but you are not expected to consult RDA continually nor to familiarise yourself with the exact wording of RDA instructions.

**More about FRBR**

FRBR not only provides key principles for RDA but also provides its terminology and structure, so it is useful to know something about it.

The FRBR project was set up to clarify “what it is that we expect the record to achieve in terms of answering user needs” and to set minimum standards for national bibliographic agencies which would enable them to reduce costs while ensuring that essential user needs were met.

**FRBR user tasks**

In order to ensure that everything bibliographic cataloguers did was actually helping catalogue users, FRBR identified four types of *task* performed by the users of library catalogues:

- **Find** materials corresponding to the user’s initial search criteria
- **Identify** which of the materials found really satisfy the user’s requirements\(^2\)
- **Select** from the materials identified the ones most appropriate to the user’s needs, e.g. the materials easiest to handle or to understand
- **Obtain** the selected material by purchase, borrowing, online access, etc.

**FRBR entities**

Adopting an “entity analysis” technique from the field of database development, the project aimed to identify the *entities* (= ‘objects of interest’) which are of most importance for these user tasks and the *relationships* between those entities. This is the kind of thing that people do whenever they have to organise material to suit other people’s needs. For instance, if you were designing a website you would have to decide how to divide material between pages so that each page dealt with a coherent, useful chunk (= defining objects of interest) and what links to make between the pages (= defining relationships).

The FRBR report came up with three groups of entities. Ideally each entity would have its own record, and this would contain links to other records to show the relationships between the entities represented; but this cannot be achieved in a MARC environment.

- **Group I** entities form a hierarchy corresponding to how a user might move from an initial very general idea of the resource s/he wants to obtaining the most suitable specific resource available.
  - **Work** - a ‘distinct intellectual or artistic creation,’ such as Carroll’s *Alice’s adventures in Wonderland* or the Disney film *Alice in Wonderland*. Entities in different intellectual/artistic forms, e.g. novels, films, plays, paintings, maps, sonatas, concertos, are always considered separate works.

\(^2\) FRBR and RDA use the word ‘identify’ to mean both ‘provide an individuating description’ and ‘recognise an individual resource from its description’, so it covers a cataloguing task as well as a user task.
- Expression - the intellectual/artistic realisation of a work as particular words, notation, sounds, images, movements, shapes, etc. An expression of Carroll’s *Alice’s adventures in Wonderland* would be a particular edition in a particular translation in a particular language in a particular broad medium (e.g. text or audio), perhaps with subordinate intellectual/artistic additions such as illustrations or an introduction or notes.

- Manifestation - the embodiment of an expression in a physical\(^3\) form, as a particular publication, production or similar. AACR2’s bibliographic ‘items’, i.e. the resources for which we create catalogue records, are ‘manifestations’ in RDA terminology.

- Items - particular instances of manifestations, e.g. copies of books or videos, or individual performances of ballets. Items may be single-part or multipart.

The distinction between works and expressions is rather a fuzzy one. The FRBR concept of ‘work’ is sometimes explained in terms of an idea in a creator’s head, but that is, of course, a simplification. Intellectual and artistic creations do not typically spring into being in a creator’s head as pure ideas with clear boundaries, without influences and input from other creators and free from association with particular words, movements, etc. Moreover, later modifications such as revisions or additions often involve some new creative intellectual and artistic input and may cumulatively result in major intellectual/artistic differences, without there being any one point where there is clearly a change of work. The FRBR report offers the general rule that “when the modification of a work involves a significant degree of independent intellectual or artistic effort, the result is viewed, for the purpose of this study, as a new work,” but tends to rely on lists and examples to indicate what kinds of effort are ‘significant’ and acknowledges that different cultures might draw boundaries differently.

The specific FRBR decisions as to which types of information are work-level and which are expression-level are perhaps best understood simply as the judgment of a committee of experienced information professionals as to how to group bibliographic resources most helpfully for the benefit of information users, that is, which kinds of difference most users would want to be top-level and which kinds they would expect to drill down for.

It may come as a surprise that the FRBR report applies the WEMI (work-expression-manifestation-item) hierarchy to aggregates and components as well as to distinct units. This means, for instance, that an agency may create a work-level record for the content of a compilation such as *Your best-loved classical tunes*, even though the assembled pieces of music did not begin life as a single distinct intellectual/artistic creation and the intellectual/artistic effort involved in assembling them was negligible. Such pragmatism underlines that the WEMI structure is primarily a practical tool for organising data, not a philosophy that we have to buy into.

- **Group II** entities are the kinds of thing which can be responsible for the intellectual/artistic content or for the physical embodiment of a resource: persons, families and corporate bodies. FRBR\(^4\) encourages recording and harvesting of data about these entities for their own sake, not just as a way of arranging bibliographic records, e.g. by recording occupations and places of work in authority records even when this is not required for individuation. In future library systems users might be able to look at these enriched authority records as well as at bibliographic records.

---

\(^3\) ‘Physical’ forms include electronic realisations.

\(^4\) Strictly speaking this is covered mainly by FRBR’s sibling, FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Data).
• **Group III** entities are, roughly speaking, the subjects of works: **concepts, objects, events** and **places**. These may eventually be covered by RDA, but nothing is ready yet except an interim chapter on places to enable the use of placenames as jurisdictions and qualifiers.

**Relationships**

Because the relationships between entities are very important in FRBR, relationships are elements in their own right. The following diagram shows two related WEMI hierarchies, one for Tolstoy’s novel *Voina i mir* and one for a film based on it. The ‘primary relationships’, i.e. the hierarchical WEMI relationships, are shown in red and a selection of its other relationships in blue, e.g. the relationship of the novel to its author Tolstoy, the relationship of a particular copy to its owner and the relationship between the novel and the film based on it.

You can imagine any number of ways in which different catalogue users might enter the catalogue at different ‘entities’ and travel via the relationship links to other entities they might like to know about. For instance, a grandchild of Constance Garnett’s might out of curiosity look to see if the library had anything relating to his grandmother, find the link to her translation of *War and Peace*, then the links to a particular publication and a particular copy, and obtain that copy. Alternatively, she might move from the translation to the record for the work itself, find a link in that to an online description (an external resource, not owned by the library), decide that the novel looks like heavy going, follow the link to the film and eventually get a copy of the video instead.

RDA offers various lists of specific relationship terms, e.g. ‘author’, ‘editor’, ‘abridgement of’, ‘abstract of’, ‘adaptation of’ (see 1e, below). Relationship terms can be entered in MARC records, but they will be of much greater value in a post-MARC environment.
FRAD and FRSAD

These are further developments of the FRBR project, to specify functional requirements for authority data (i.e. NACO records) and subject authority data respectively.

FRBR, MARC and the RDA Toolkit

Although in principle all FRBR entities should have separate records, this will have to wait for the development of a new bibliographic framework and new library systems. MARC does, of course, have separate authority records for works and expressions, persons, corporate bodies and (increasingly) families; but MARC bibliographic records contain not only data about the particular manifestation (e.g. title proper; publication details; system requirements) but also information which relates to the work (e.g. access points for creators; uniform title; target audience) and information which relates to the expression (e.g. access points for contributors; medium; contents list; illustrations).

New MARC subfields have been introduced to accommodate relationship terms, but their use is not mandatory and current OLIS policy is to enter only the more straightforward terms.

Because the new OLIS documentation for RDA/MARC21 on the Cataloguing documentation page is task-oriented, it follows the order and structure of MARC bibliographic records rather than the FRBR structure used in RDA.

You can find RDA itself and related resources in the online RDA Toolkit, which includes a mapping from MARC rules to RDA instructions. For a brief guide, see RDA structure and the RDA Toolkit.

More RDA vocabulary

RDA has abandoned vocabulary associated with catalogue cards, e.g. ‘heading’, ‘tracing’ and ‘main entry’, although these terms remain in use in the MARC standards. Much of RDA’s key vocabulary is derived from FRBR, and not all of it is covered in the RDA glossary. Here are some more useful RDA terms.

- **attributes** - characteristics of an entity, including its physical characteristics, history and label-type information (e.g. information from covers and containers), but not relationships.
- **authorised access point (AAP)** - controlled access point.
- **creator** - an entity which (i) has primary responsibility for the intellectual/artistic content of a resource and (ii) can therefore combine with the preferred title of the resource to create a name-title AAP and (iii) can therefore be the main entry of a MARC record (but see under ‘other person/family/corporate body associated with a work’).
- **contributor** - an entity which contributes expression-level intellectual/artistic material to a work, e.g. an editor, annotator, translator, illustrator, arranger. A contributor cannot be the first element of a name-title AAP and therefore cannot be the main entry of a MARC record.
- **describing** - in principle this term covers any recording of attributes, but in RDA it is used particularly for types of attribute thought to be used more in selection than identification, mainly physical attributes.
- **family** - ‘two or more persons related by birth, marriage, adoption, civil union, or similar legal status, or who otherwise present themselves as a family’.

---

5 There are links to the new documentation on the Cataloguing documentation page and the CSS courses page.
identifying - (i) for user: confirming that a resource meets the his/her criteria; (ii) for cataloguer: recording the types of attribute by which users confirm that resources meet their criteria (rather than those used mainly for selection between suitable resources).

main entry [not used in RDA] - see under ‘creator’ and ‘other person/family/corporate body associated with a work’; if no Group II entity is responsible for the work, main entry is under title.

other person/family/corporate body associated with a work - as you would expect, this is usually just an entity other than the creator, e.g. a dedicatee or addressee or an interested corporate body, and therefore not a candidate for the main entry of a MARC record. Exception: RDA does not class the jurisdictions and ecclesiastical bodies responsible for issuing laws and liturgical works as their creators, but does say that they should be the first element in the AAPs for such works, so they will be main entry in MARC records for such works.

person - ‘an individual or an identity established by an individual (either alone or in collaboration with one or more other individuals).’ This definition is puzzling, because RDA clearly intends person-type identities established by corporate bodies (e.g. the ‘authors’ whose works are really written by a series of publisher’s hacks) to be considered as persons. For RDA, ‘person’ also includes fictional persons, such as Kermit the Frog.

preferred name - standardised form of a Group II entity’s name. AAPs are based on preferred names but may have additions such as dates, expansions and qualifiers.

preferred title - title of a work, usually the original title in the original language, roughly equivalent to AACR2’s ‘uniform title’ but without any parenthetical qualifiers. AAPs for works are based on their preferred titles but may also have parenthetical qualifiers for individuation and may be preceded by the AAP for a Group II entity, forming a name-title.

to record - to enter data of any kind; but the term is used particularly for data which is not transcribed.

resource - the WEMI terms can feel a little awkward in some contexts (e.g. when talking about manifestations of aggregate works which contain manifestations of various individual works…). The term ‘resource’ is a widely-used alternative. It may be used for any of the WEMI entities, including aggregates and components, but is most often used instead of ‘manifestation’ to mean ‘a thing represented by a bibliographic record’ (AACR2’s bibliographic ‘item’).

variant access point - ‘see’ cross-reference (in authority records).

WEMI - the Group I hierarchy of entities, work-expression-manifestation-item.

What is changing for OLIS?

1. New elements and new MARC

RDA offers a wide range of elements, but specifies certain elements as ‘core’, i.e., mandatory. Sometimes only the first occurrence of an element (e.g. first-listed creator) is core. Some core elements are conditional: for example, copyright date is core for RDA only in the absence of a date of publication. The Library of Congress and Program for Cooperative Cataloguing have specified a few more elements as ‘core for LC/PCC’ and leave some other elements to cataloguer’s judgment.
The core and recommended elements for OLIS and the MARC coding we use are much the same as they were under AACR2, but with the following changes:

1a. RDA coding

RDA records are characterised by ‘rda’ in 040 $e and, if they use standard punctuation, ‘i’ in LDR 18. 040$e should follow subfields $a and $b but precede subfields $c and $d. Keeping it near the beginning of the field should make it easier to find.

1b. Publication and copyright dates (264)

- We will use a new field, 264, instead of 260. The difference lies in the indicators:
  - For serials and multipart, the **1st indicator** can be used to show whether a statement is the earliest (blank) or intervening (2) or current/latest (3) statement. For single-part monographs it is always blank.
  - The **2nd indicator** shows whether the statement concerns production (0), publication (1), distribution (2), manufacture (3) or copyright (4).

- **RDA requires a publication date element.** If there is no publication date on the resource, you must supply one, on the basis of copyright, distribution or printing information or of publisher’s or bookseller’s information.

  - The date may be **conjectural** and/or use a **date range**, using one of the following models:
    - [2012?]
    - [2011 or 2012]
    - [between 1800 and 1899?]
    - [not before September 6, 1997]
    - [not after November 22, 1963]
    - [between September 6, 1992 and July 31, 1995]

  - If absolutely no conjecture can be made (which is hardly conceivable), use ‘[date of publication not identified]’.

- **Copyright date** is a separate element in RDA, and is **core for OLIS** if found on the resource. This means that you might need both to use the copyright date to infer the publication date and to enter it as an element in its own right. Note the difference in 2nd indicator between the publication and copyright fields.

```plaintext
on colophon
Fleecem Books, Taunton.
©2012
```

```plaintext
264 _1 $aTaunton : $bFleecem Books, $c[2012?]
```

```plaintext
264 _4 $c ©2012
```

- If you are entering different dates for publication and copyright, you should use the value ‘t’ in 008/06 and follow it with both the publication date and the copyright date (unless the resource is a reprint/reissue, requiring ‘r’ in 008/06).

---

Please note that this formulation replaces the AACR2 practice of giving incomplete dates, e.g. '[18--]'. The corresponding date in 008 should still have 'unknown' digits, e.g. '18uu'.
If multiple copyright (©) or phonogram (℗) dates are found, usually only the last one is recorded; but if earlier ones clearly apply to distinct and important intellectual/artistic aspects of the resource, they may also be recorded. This would be the case if, for instance, an audio recording with a given phonogram date had an insert with a later copyright date.7

Copyright date is core for RDA only if the date of publication is ‘not identified,’ so downloaded records will not necessarily include copyright dates. Please add these if it involves minimal trouble, but do not feel you have to do so for records which you would otherwise trust (recent LC and BL full-level records).

264s for distribution or printing (i.e., manufacture) are needed only if place and/or publisher is ‘not identified’ in the publication statement or if the date is ‘not identified’ and there is no copyright date. (The element which is most often ‘not identified’ is publisher, because place or date information may be conjectural but publisher information may not be.)

- Even if only one publication element is ‘not identified’, full distribution or manufacture statements should be recorded, because otherwise elements from different statements might be combined misleadingly in user-facing displays.
- Any unnecessary printing information in downloaded records should be removed, because it restricts the coverage of the record to that specific printing, but distribution information should be retained.

1c. Content type, media type, carrier type (336, 337, 338)

- RDA does not use General Material Designations (245 $h). These are superseded by new core elements which are required even for textual materials. They convey information about material-type, in a codified way which suits machines rather than people. Ideally the machines will use the data to generate user-friendly icons in public-facing catalogues, to help people select the kind of resource they want. For simple books they are entered as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
336 \_a & \text{text} \_2\text{rdacontent} & \text{[unless resource is all illustrations]} \\
336 \_a & \text{still image} \_2\text{rdacontent} & \text{[if resource is all or chiefly illustrations or illustrations are particularly important]} \\
337 \_a & \text{unmediated} \_2\text{rdamedia} \\
338 \_a & \text{volume} \_2\text{rdacarrier}
\end{align*}
\]

- The data in subfield $a$ gives an indication of:

  - **content type (336)** - the form of the resource’s content, e.g. ‘text’, ‘notated music’, ‘performed music’, ‘still image’ [RDA 6.9]. We usually use ‘text’ for books, but for books which are recorded as ‘all illustrations’ in 300 $b$ we use ‘still image’ and for books recorded as ‘chiefly illustrations’ or in which illustrations are particularly important we use both.

  - **media type (337)** - whether any type of equipment is required to access it, e.g. ‘audio’, ‘video’, ‘computer’ [RDA 3.2]

---

7 This is a revision to the original RDA instruction, agreed in November 2012 and due to be incorporated into the RDA text in April 2013.
- carrier type (338) - its specific physical form, e.g. ‘audio disc’, ‘audiocassette’, ‘computer disc’ [RDA 3.3].

- The terms used are taken from set vocabulary lists and the list used is specified in subfield $2$. You can find the full lists of RDA terms for 336 in Table 6.1 [RDA 6.9.1.3], for 337 in Table 3.1 [RDA 3.2.1.3] and for 338 in RDA 3.3.1.3.

- Some agencies enter brief codes instead of whole-word terms, using subfield $b$ rather than subfield $a$. If you find these in downloaded records you do not need to change them.

- SOLO cannot yet make good use of these fields, so, as an interim measure, RDA records will have something which looks like a GMD generated for SOLO from fixed-field data. This will not affect the records in Aleph.

1d. Colour

- For RDA, ‘illustrations’ and ‘colour’ are separate elements, so we cannot integrate them into a single phrase such as ‘coloured illustrations’ in 300 $b$.

- We will follow the JSC\(^8\) RDA example records in presenting these elements as:

  :$b$colour illustrations
  :$b$illustrations (some colour)
  :$b$illustrations (chiefly colour)

- However, an earlier version of the JSC records used ‘:$b$illustrations (colour)’ and it is likely that you will find this variant in some downloaded records. If you do, you can accept it. You can also accept spelling variants, e.g. ‘colour’.

1e. Relators

- Because of the importance of relationships to FRBR, RDA has specific elements to clarify relationships:

  a) Relators for use with person, family and corporate body access points. These follow the AAP, in subfield $e$ and are preceded by a comma unless the access point ends with a hyphen. You can use multiple relators if an entity has multiple roles.

  100 _ $a$Slugge-Bayte, Primrose, $se$author, $se$illustrator.
  245 10 $a$Springtime rhymes :$b$poems in memory of Heliotrope Slugge-Bayte /$c$by Primrose and Petunia Slugge-Bayte ; with illustrations by Primrose Slugge-
  Bayte and photography by Vision Unlimited; edited by Joan Silver.
  700 1_ $a$Slugge-Bayte, Petunia, $se$author.
  710 2_ $a$Vision Unlimited,$se$illustrator.\(^9\)
  700 1_ $a$Slugge-Bayte, Heliotrope, $se$dedicatee.
  700 1_ $a$Silver, Joan,$se$editor.

- There are separate lists of terms for the creators of works, for other persons/ families/ corporate bodies associated with a work, and for contributors to expressions. Most of the terms are applicable to persons, families or corporate bodies. The most useful terms are listed below, and you can find full lists in RDA Appendix I. It is worth checking the definitions, which are sometimes quite restrictive.

---

\(^8\) Joint Steering Group for RDA. The example records are mounted in the Toolkit’s ‘Tools’ tab.

\(^9\) Not ‘photographer’, because that term is available only for creators of photographic works.
i. For creators: artist, author, cartographer, compiler, composer, interviewer, interviewee, photographer.

ii. For other persons/ families/ corporate bodies associated with a work: addressee, dedicatee, degree granting institution, film director, television director, issuing body, host institution, film producer, television producer, sponsoring body.

iii. For contributors: abridger, editor, editor of compilation, illustrator, interviewer (expression), interviewee (expression), translator, writer of added commentary, writer of added text.

- The terms for creators may be used only for entities which have work-level responsibility.
- These are usually the entities which occur in 1XX fields or share the same responsibility as the entity in the 1XX field. For example, if a work has six collaborating authors, only the first will be in 1XX, but all six will have the relator term ‘author’. However, some kinds of work are collaborations between creators of more than one kind. For example, in a musical both songs and lyrics are integral, and in a graphic novel both text and pictures are integral. In such cases the collaborators would have different relator terms, but all at creator level.
- In compilations of works by different entities, any entity which has a relationship to one or more components and merits an AAP should be given the same relator(s) as it would have had if the component(s) had been published separately. For instance, a set of twenty essays by different people would be entered under title, but a person mentioned in a statement of responsibility who had clearly written six of those essays would deserve an AAP with the relator ‘author’. This means that records with title as main entry may still have AAPs with creator-level relator terms.
- OLIS recommends the use of this type of relator, as long as there is a suitable term available. Unfortunately they cannot be displayed in SOLO, because SOLO would treat the relator as part of the hyperlinked access point and would therefore restrict searches on the link to the same entity in the same role. We expect that they will nevertheless be useful in future systems, not only for display but also for filtering searches by contribution-type.
- Relator terms are not used in the name elements of name-title AAPs.

```
X00 __ $aSlugge-Bayte, Primrose.$tSpringtime rhymes.
```

- Downloaded records may have brief relator codes in subfield $4 instead of relator terms in subfield $e. These should be retained, but they do not do the same job as relator terms in $e, so please add terms in $e if practical.

b) Relators for use with work, expression and manifestation access points. These precede the access point, in subfield $i, e.g.

```
700 0_ $ITranslation of:$aHomer.$tIliad.
```

10 ‘compiler’ is used only for entities responsible for creating a new intellectual/ artistic work by assembling data, e.g. the compilers of bibliographies and directories. Anthologisers, editors of conference papers and other aggregators of existing works are given ‘editor of compilation’ from list (iii).

11 ‘editor’ is used for entities which revise works, add introductions, notes, etc., or prepare resources for publication or distribution; but for the writer of a radical revision or of a revision for which the original author is no longer listed as responsible, you should use ‘author’ from list (i).

12 Use your judgment as to whether the interview is part of the primary content of the resource and as to whether interviewer, interviewee or both is/are creating primary content. Interviewer and/or interviewee will have the terms from the contributor list, qualified by ‘(expression)’ if the interview is supplementary content (e.g. serving as commentary or appendix) or if their individual input is subordinate, e.g. just prompting a celebrity to talk freely.
OLIS does not support adding these, because the relator terms available depend on whether the relationship is work-level, expression-level or manifestation-level, which can be tricky to work out; but they should be accepted if found in downloaded records.

Because we are not using these relators, we must continue to make 500 notes to explain any work and expression access points which are not explained elsewhere in the description.

100 1_ $aSlugge-Bayte, Primrose,$eauthor.
245 10 $aHelpful heroes /$cby Primrose Slugge-Bayte.
500 __ $aChildren’s play based on the Iliad, free from episodes of sex or violence.
700 0_ $aHomer.$tIliad.$kSelections.

Some agencies, e.g. LC, sometimes use 76X, 77X or 78X linking fields instead of 5XX notes to show relationships, and these should be accepted if found in downloaded records.

775 08 $iRevision of:$tContemporary art and multicultural education$dNew York : Museum of Contemporary Art, 1996$w(DLC)95010979

1f. Families

- RDA has added families to the types of entity capable of authorship and therefore eligible for access points. They use the same MARC tags as persons, but with 1st indicator ‘3’. They are used mainly for collections of family correspondence and papers.

- The name and form of name for a family is chosen in the same way as that for an individual person and qualified by the family-type in brackets. Relators are used with family AAPs in the same way as for individuals.

  X00 3_ $aSlugge-Bayte (Family),$eauthor.
  700 3_ $aMcSlugg (Clan),$ededicatee.

- If the family is very closely associated with a date-range and/or place, add these, separating qualifiers by space-colon-space. (Such qualifiers could restrict the AAP unhelpfully, making it impossible to use it for materials relating to the same family and a slightly different place or time, so we do not encourage their use.) If RDA requires the placename to be qualified by one or more larger places, add these, separating the levels with commas.

  X00 3_ $aSlugge-Bayte (Family :$d1918-1945 :$cHaslemere, England),$eauthor.

- Unfortunately, no attempt has yet been made to harmonise the form and uses of RDA access points for families with those created for LCSH. This means that there are now separate Name and Subject records for the same families, for use in 1XX/7XX and 6XX fields respectively. Please be very careful when looking up authorities to use only appropriate records. You can easily distinguish Subject authority records for families from Name records, because ‘family’ is not in brackets and the Library of Congress Control Number (010 field) includes the prefix ‘sh’ for ‘subject heading’ rather than ‘n’ for name.

  LCSH access point for use in 6XX

  sh 86000793
  $aAsher family

See 3.4, below.
RDA access point for use in 1XX/7XX

n 2011079793
$aAsher (Family :$cWorcester, Mass.)

And finally

- You can find more details and examples for these elements in the RDA/MARC21 training/reference modules on the Cataloguing documentation page.
- You will probably find quite a variety of other elements in downloaded records. In general we will retain, without checking or editing, any elements which are not covered in OLIS training but will save to OLIS (i.e., no red warnings).

2. Resource description

2.1 Sources for the description

- The preferred source for the resource as a whole [RDA 2.2] and the preferred sources for specific elements (see the RDA sections for individual elements) depend on which of the following groups the resource falls into:
  - One or more pages, leaves, sheets or cards (or images of these), including atlases, scores, etc.
  - Moving images
  - Other.
- Square brackets are now required only when information which should normally be taken from the resource itself is supplied from outside the resource.
- The following table summarises the sources for the first group, in MARC order. (Field and subfield codes which may be repeated are marked with an asterisk.)
### Table A: Elements, sources and MARC coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Sub-field</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Sources in order of preference (for books)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>020*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Identifier for the manifestation (=ISBN)</td>
<td>Any source; but for $a$ prefer the latest and/or most plausible. Record in $z$ any ISBN found on the resource which is incorrectly formed or misapplied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Invalid ISBN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Title proper</td>
<td>Title page; cover or jacket; caption; masthead; colophon; anywhere on the resource, with preference for a source where information is formally presented (e.g. title page verso, slip case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n*</td>
<td>Numbering of part, section or supplement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p*</td>
<td>Title of part, section or supplement</td>
<td>External sources: accompanying material; published descriptions of resource; container in which it is housed; any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Other title information (subtitle and similar)</td>
<td>If there is no title page, specify the source of the title in a note. Other title information may come only from the same source as title proper; statements of responsibility may come from any of the sources listed, but with preference for the same source as title proper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Statement of responsibility relating to title proper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Variant title</td>
<td>Any source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Designation of edition/revision</td>
<td>Same source as title proper; another source within the resource; external source as for 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Statement of responsibility relating to edition/revision</td>
<td>Same source as designation of edition/revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264*</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>Same source as publisher’s name; another source within the resource; external source as for 245.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b*</td>
<td>Publisher’s name</td>
<td>Same source as title proper; another source within the resource; external source as for 245.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Date of publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264*</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Copyright date</td>
<td>Any source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Extent (= pagination)</td>
<td>Evidence presented by the resource itself, including any accompanying materials or container; additional evidence from any source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Illustrative content</td>
<td>(Strictly speaking, RDA allows information for Illustrative content and Content type to be taken from any source, but it is hard to envisage a situation where the resource itself would not present this information.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Content type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Media type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Carrier type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Series statement (incl. any subseries)</td>
<td>Series title page; another source within the resource; external sources as for 245.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ISSN of series/subseries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v*</td>
<td>Numbering within series/subseries</td>
<td>Any source within the resource [revision pending].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5XX*</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Any source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For materials with sources in multiple languages or scripts, see Module 4: Foreign-language materials, 4.3c-d.

---

14 In principle when a title consists of a common title followed by the number and/or name of a part the whole thing constitutes the title proper, but this table shows them separately because they have their own subfield codes.
The main differences from AACR2 for books, sheets and cards are:

- title-page verso is never mentioned specifically, although it will still often get preference as a source in which the information is formally presented.
- dust jackets are now specifically considered to be part of the resource (and, indeed, take precedence over many other sources of information) so information from these does not require square brackets; however, it is still essential to make a 500 note, e.g. ‘Series information from jacket’ because jackets do not always stay with the resource.
- parallel titles may be taken from any source within the resource; and if the title proper is taken from outside the resource, the parallel title may be taken from the same source.

2.2 Recording the description

2.2a Omissions

RDA attaches a great deal of importance to ‘representation’, i.e., that ‘the data describing a resource should reflect the resource’s representation of itself’ [0.4.3.4], so it recommends few omissions; but it also attaches importance to the FRBR aim of setting minimum standards which would reduce costs, so in many cases only the first occurrence of an element has to be recorded.

- The AACR2 ‘rule of 3’ has been abandoned. This used to restrict (i) the number of entities recorded in statements of responsibility as doing the same job and (ii) the corresponding access points. Only the first entity is core for RDA, but OLIS emphatically recommends generosity. It is hardly ever appropriate to omit entities which contribute significantly to substantial academic or specialised works, and we never omit contributors known to have Oxford University connections. In the case of extremely long lists and/or slight publications, please use your own judgment.

100 1_ $aGrey, Jean$q(Jean Patricia),$eauthor.
245 10 $aMemories of Little Happening /$Jean Grey [and fourteen others].

- Titles, qualifications and terms of address (‘Mr.’, ‘Dr.’, ‘Rev.’, etc.) are not omitted from statements of responsibility, but you may optionally omit background information (e.g. details of academic posts held by contributors).

- Places, publishers and dates are not tidied up very much.
  - If a publication statement gives a town and one or more larger jurisdictions, include them all in 264 $a, even if not needed for identification; but if there is a full address you do not need to give it all.
  - Do not reduce the publisher’s name to the shortest internationally recognisable form. For instance, retain ‘The’, ‘Press’, ‘Publishing’, ‘plc’, etc.
  - If a publishing hierarchy is given, include at least the highest and lowest level, although you can omit intermediate levels.
  - If the date on the resource includes a year or day, transcribe it as found, e.g. ‘1 April 2013’.

- Only the first place of publication and first publisher are required by RDA, so you no longer need to worry about the ‘first place in the home country of the cataloguing agency’.

- However, you should still include a second publisher if:
i. multiple publishers are grammatically linked; or

ii. the resource is published jointly but with separate ISBNs for the publishers, requiring the use of the publishers’ names as ISBN qualifiers.

You should include a second place if:

i. the resource is published in multiple places with separate ISBNs for the places, requiring the use of the placenames as ISBN qualifiers; or

ii. a formal statement (e.g. on t.p. verso) makes clear that the work of publication was done in a place other than the place appearing first in a long alphabetical list on the title page.15

2.2b Capitalisation

- RDA offers some new options for capitalisation. OLIS and most major agencies will keep to the familiar practices, including using sentence-case for titles (i.e., titles begin with a capital but other words are capitalised only if they are proper names or if capitalisation is required by the language in use). However, you may find that downloaded records have capitalisation as found on the resource, and you are not expected to change this.

- RDA Appendix A gives general rules for capitalisation and also covers awkward cases, such as capitalisation of soil-types or Finnish names of scientific and economic institutions.

15 This is an OLIS decision, taking advantage of RDA’s greater flexibility as to how many places and publishers are recorded. The first place listed should still always be given first, with a corresponding code in 008/15-17.
2.2c Abbreviations & language

- In most cases RDA does not abbreviate words nor use Latin terms, so:
  - in 245, if you decide to omit some entities from a long statement of responsibility, you would use e.g. ’[and six others]’, not ‘... [et al.]’.
  - in 260 $a and $b you would use ‘[Place of publication not identified]’ and ‘[publisher not identified]’, not ‘[S.l.]’ and ‘[s.n.]’; you may also use ‘[date of publication not identified]’ in 260 $c, but this should hardly ever be necessary (see 2.2f).
  - in dates in access points for persons you would use ‘active’ rather than ‘fl.’ (= floruit).
- In transcribed elements, any abbreviations found on the resource are retained.
- The familiar abbreviations for U.S. states, Canadian provinces, Australian territories and a few countries are still used in qualifiers in access points for smaller places, corporate bodies, etc. [RDA B.11].
- What RDA calls ‘metric symbols’ such as ‘cm’, ‘mm’ are not considered as abbreviations, so are not routinely followed by a full stop [B.5.2], although a full stop may occur as end-of-field punctuation.
- Roman alphabet abbreviations are still required in 300 fields for Dimensions and Duration (ft., in., hr., min., sec.), in 8XX subfield $v (but not the corresponding 490) and in a few specialist fields.

2.2d Numbers

- Numbers are usually transcribed as found, whether in words, arabic numerals or roman numerals. However, words are converted to arabic numerals in the following cases:
  - Year of publication and copyright and year in which a degree was granted
  - Numbering within series or subseries
  - Numbering of leaves or pages.
- Arabic numerals are still required in 8XX subfield $v (because the numbering format is under authority control), but the corresponding 490 will have numbering as found on the resource.
- There are various options for dealing with roman numerals in years of publication, copyright and granting of degrees. Most agencies have decided simply to copy them as found, but we have decided to copy them as found and add the arabic form in square brackets, e.g. ‘MCMXXX [1930]’, because this is more helpful to users.

2.2e Punctuation

- RDA rarely prescribes punctuation, so the RDA examples in the Toolkit will not help. OLIB, like other major agencies, will continue to use the ISBD punctuation with which we are familiar from AACR2. LC-PCC-PS examples show ISBD punctuation.
- There are a few places where new RDA elements are not fully covered by ISBD rules. The most important one is the combination of ‘colour’ and ‘illustrations’ elements in 300 $b (see 1d, above).
- When transcribing, do not replace ‘...’ in a title with ‘--’ or square brackets with round ones.
- For use of square brackets, see below.
2.2f Approximations, corrections, clarifications and missing data

- **Imprecise** information is expressed in English words, not Latin abbreviations.

  300 __ $aApproximately 700 pages
  X00 1_ $aSmith, John,$dactive 1922-1940.

- Because of RDA's commitment to *representation* it rarely allows cataloguers to supply corrections or clarifications or missing information in square brackets. Statements of responsibility, publishers' names and series statements may be supplied in square brackets only if the data has been found in a reliable external source. In most cases cataloguers' corrections and clarifications may be provided only as 500 notes.

- You may no longer supply *clarifications as other title information*, e.g. 'Madame Butterfly : [programme]' or 'The life of Pi : [review]'. Instead you would make a 5XX note.\(^{16}\)

  245 00 $aMadame Butterfly.
  500 __ $aProgramme of opera performed at the Royal Opera House on Thursday 13th November 1980.

- But you may supply *clarifications of responsibility* in statements of responsibility:


- If there is a *mistake in the title*, you should provide the correction in field 246 and include subfield $i$, which allows you to provide a note as well as an access point. Please make sure that you use first indicator '1', so that the note displays.

  245 02 $aHow to be chased /$cby Cousin Euphemia.
  246 1_ $iTitle should read:$aHow to be chaste

- You may correct *seriously misleading pagination or foliation* as follows:

  300 __ $a690, that is, 960 pages

- If recording a sequence of *unnumbered pages, leaves or columns*, describe them as 'unnumbered' rather than putting the number in square brackets:

  300 __ $a319 pages, 8 unnumbered pages of plates

- In one respect RDA allows a little more cataloguer-supplied information: it allows the use of 'incorrect' or 'invalid' to qualify ISBNs. The former would be used for badly formed ISBNs (wrong length or typos) while the latter would be used for ISBNs which do not apply to the resource being catalogued, e.g. if the ISBN has previously been used for a different resource. However, if the ISBN is just for a version in a different format listed on the resource, you should qualify by format.

  020 __ $a186205102X$z186205102 (incorrect)
  500 __ $aISBN 186205102 on title page verso lacks the final digit.

  020 __ $a082640913 (paperback)
  020 __ $z0826469302 (invalid)
  500 __ $aTitle page verso is that of 2004 hardback issue, including ISBN 0826469302, which applies to the hardback only.\(^{17}\)

  020 __ $a1859354122 (paperback)
  020 __ $z1859354130 (pdf)

- You would still use *square brackets* in the following cases:

---

\(^{16}\) But there is currently a proposal to change RDA to allow this kind of clarification in 245 $b.

\(^{17}\) In this example the resource was not the first paperback issue, so could not be added to the hardback record.
• to provide a devised title for materials which have no title at all

245 00 $a[Letters between Queen Victoria and John Brown].

• to clarify responsibilities in a statement of responsibility

• to summarise a list of entities sharing a responsibility in a statement of responsibility

• to show that information normally taken from the resource (see Table A, above) was taken from outside the resource, or, in the cases of place or date of publication, to supply a conjecture (but not to supply a correction if there is incorrect information on the resource)

264 _1 $a[U.K.?] :$b[Flyby Enterprises],$c2010.
500 __ $aPublisher’s name from vendor’s website.

• to supply a brief designation of edition if “a resource lacks an edition statement but is known to contain significant changes from other editions ... if it is considered to be important for identification or access”; the nature of the change should be explained in a note

250 __ $a[Revised edition].
500 __ $aMany of the hymns in this issue have been reworded to remove gender bias.

• to supply a larger place to assist with identification or access for the place of publication, e.g. ‘Dublin [Ohio]’

• to provide a Common Era date in arabic numerals if the date on the item is from a different calendar or uses different numerals

$c5730 [1969 or 1970]

• if place, publisher or date is unknown and if, in the case of place or date, no conjecture can be made.

264 _1 $a[Place of publication not identified] :$b[publisher not identified],$c[date of publication not identified]

However, your choice of fixed field data should always be based on the corrected information, not on incorrect transcribed data.

2.2g Physical descriptions for boxed and multimedia materials

• If the resource is in a container, give the dimensions in terms of the container. Height is sufficient for a book's slipcase unless its proportions are unusual, but for portfolios give height and width and for other boxes give all dimensions. 300 $c just has ‘case’, etc., rather than ‘in case’, etc.

300 __ $a5x1, 251 pages ;$ccase 25 cm
300 __ $a15 various pieces ;$c60 x 45 cm x 10 cm
500 __ $aBox contains 6 test tubes, 1 rack, 1 pipette, 6 bottles of chemicals and an instruction manual.

• If the resource is in a container and the material is all textual and interesting or complex enough to be worth a note and the parts in the containers will not be circulated

---

18 RDA does not actually require square brackets for devised titles, but the British Library's Monograph Workflow uses them, and we follow this.

19 This instruction is a recent and anomalous addition to RDA. According to FRBR, the designation of edition is an attribute of the manifestation, just a set of words which identifies the particular publication, not a truth about its content, so it should always be a transcription of an actual statement. OCLC, with the support of LC and BL, pushed for this change to facilitate their automated matching and deduplication algorithms.

20 Note that each element has its own square brackets, rather than a single set for the whole statement.
**separately**, also give the extent (300 $a) in terms of the containers, and give details of the materials contained in a note.

300 __ $a1 portfolio : $b illustrations ; $c60 x 45 cm
500 __ $a Portfolio contains 7 architectural drawings.

- If a resource (i) is of various carrier types and (ii) is not boxed and (iii) cannot reasonably be divided into primary material of a single carrier type and accompanying material, use multiple 300 fields. If it would help, use $3 subfields to indicate which part of the resource each 300 field applies to.

300 __ $3 v. 1-3 $a3 volumes ; $c 25-28 cm
300 __ $3 v. 4-5 $a2 CD-ROMs.

- Do not give dimensions for standard carrier types, such as CD-ROMs (see example above).

- For more on physical descriptions, see RDA/MARC21 course Module 3: Complex and difficult cases. See also Module 5: Non-book materials and Module 6: Bibliographic records for multipart.

### 3. Access

Please bear in mind that RDA uses the term ‘authorized access point’ (AAP) rather than ‘heading’, although MARC still uses ‘heading’ and most people continue to use both interchangeably.

#### 3.1 Authority records and local headings

- Many NACO authority records are still in AACR2 format, while others have been converted to RDA mechanically. All new and recently-edited (by humans) NACO records follow RDA rules.

- All AACR2 authority records which are not RDA-compatible and are awaiting human intervention have been given a 667 field with the text ‘THIS 1XX FIELD CANNOT BE USED UNDER RDA UNTIL THIS RECORD HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND/OR UPDATED’. This message is primarily addressed to NACO authority cataloguers, who are responsible for converting any authorities they deal with. Ordinary cataloguers should still use these authorities in bibliographic cataloguing; but please notify BMAC when you use such records, so that they can update the NACO record. The access point in your own bibliographic record will be automatically updated when the revised NACO record is loaded to Aleph.

- NACO records created or edited according to RDA rules may include a lot of new elements. This arises from the FRBR view of entities as objects of interest in their own right, rather than merely as ways of collocating library resources. For instance, biographical information may be added to records for persons even if not needed for individuation. This may prove very valuable if you are trying to decide whether a particular person is likely to be the author of a particular work.

- These are some of the new fields:
  - **046**: Special coded dates, which may include birth ($f$), death ($g$), beginning date of creation ($k$), ending date of creation ($l$), start period ($s$) and end period ($t$).
  - **336**: Content Type
  - **368**: Other Attributes of Person or Corporate Body
  - **370**: Associated Place
  - **371**: Address
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- 372: Field of Activity
- 373: Associated Group
- 374: Occupation
- 375: Gender
- 376: Family Information
- 377: Associated Language
- 378: Fuller Form of Personal Name
- 380: Form of Work

You can find full details of these and some more specialised fields in the MARC Authority Format under Heads - General Information.

Below is an example of an RDA NACO record for a person:

```
010 __ $anb2012012420
040 __ $aUk$beng$erda$cUk$erda
046 __ $as19450321
100 1_ $aLee Cadwell, Linda,$d1945-
370 __ $aEverett, Wash.
372 __ $aMartial arts$aKung Fu
374 __ $aTeacher
375 __ $afemale
377 __ $aeng
400 1_ $aCadwell, Linda Lee,$d1945-
400 1_ $aEmory, Linda,$d1945-
400 1_ $aLee, Linda,$d1945 Mar. 21-
667 __ $aFormerly on undifferentiated name record n00044447
670 __ $aThe Bruce Lee story, c1989:$bt.p. (Linda Lee) p.7 (She was 17 in 1963)
670 __ $aWikipedia, 17 May 2012:$b(Linda Lee Cadwell (born Linda C. Emory; March 21, 1945) is an American teacher and the widow of martial arts master and actor Bruce Lee; born in Everett, Washington, married stockbroker Bruce Cadwell in 1991; wrote the 1989 book The Bruce Lee Story)
```

If no NACO record is available, the usual rule for whether to use local OLIS bibliographic access points (the ones which are found by F3 checks but not by Ctrl-F3 checks) still holds good: if they are correctly formed use them; otherwise, create a correct access point. But some access points which were correct for AACR2 records are unfortunately incorrect for RDA ones, notably those which include terms such as ‘ca.’ or ‘fl.’ or dates such as ‘19--‘. Please form new RDA access points for your bibliographic records as necessary and let BMAC know the old and new access points. BMAC will then update the older access points, so that we do not have multiple access points for the same entity.

3.2 AAPs for persons [RDA 9]

There have been a lot of detailed changes to the instructions for creating personal access points, but these mainly affect the work of NACO cataloguers. When you need to create a new access point for a person in a bibliographic record you are still asked to add dates of birth and death and/or fuller forms of name, but not to add any more complex types of differentiation, even if the result is that the access point is not differentiated from that for a different entity. If you have good information for other
types of differentiation, or if the access point is for an important entity or of a complex kind (e.g. titles of royalty, nobility or religion; entities which have both vernacular and classicised forms of name; Arabic, Burmese, Karen, Chinese, Icelandic, Indic, Indonesian, Malay, Roman, Romanian or Thai names), please pass your information to BMAC and ask them to create a NACO record.

• The main changes affecting bibliographic work are:
  - Nonexistent persons, e.g. Kermit the Frog, and nonhuman persons such as Rin-Tin-Tin can have access points. These are created like other RDA personal name access points and are entered in X00 fields, but, unless unambiguous and very well known, they have an appropriate parenthetical qualifier in subfield $c$, e.g. ‘(Fictional character)’, ‘(Arthurian legendary character)’, ‘(Greek deity)’, ‘(Mythical bird)’, ‘(Poodle)’, ‘(Cockroach).’
  - The intention of RDA seems to be to treat nonexistent and nonhuman entities on a par with real ones, even to the extent of making one main entry if it is presented as first or principal creator. However, you should always include a note to elucidate the situation. RDA seems to treat the real creators as creators even if they are presented on the resource as mere contributors, so presumably both fictional and real creators should have the same relator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100 1_ $aHacker, James$&lt;br&gt;245 10 $aYes, Prime Minister :$bthe diaries of the Right Hon. James Hacker&lt;/br&gt;500 __ $aFictional diaries written by Jonathan Lynn and Antony Jay.</th>
<th>700 1_ $aLynn, Jonathan,$eauthor.</th>
<th>700 1_ $aJay, Antony, 1930-$eauthor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

• Abbreviations are not used unless found as part of the name. For instance, an access point could use either ‘Jr.’ or ‘Junior’, depending on how it was found. The abbreviated terms ‘ca.’, ‘b.’ and ‘d.’ are no longer used with dates.

• Dates are now represented as in the examples below. Note that you may now use dates of activity even for 20th- and 21st-century persons, but please do this only as a last resort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X00 1_ $aGumtree, Elmer T.$q(Elmer Taft),$d1912-&lt;br&gt;[only birth date known]</th>
<th>X00 1_ $aGumtree, Elmer Q.$q(Elmer Quincy),$d-1990.&lt;br&gt;[only death date known]</th>
<th>X00 1_ $aGumtree, Elmer M.$q(Elmer McKinley),$dapproximately 1910-1980.&lt;br&gt;[approximate birth and actual death dates known]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X00 1_ $aGumtree, Elmer Q.$q(Elmer Quincy),$d-1990 April 1.&lt;br&gt;[full death date needed for differentiation]</td>
<td>X00 1_ $aGumtree, Elmer J.$q(Elmer Jefferson),$d1908?-1970 or 1971.&lt;br&gt;[conjectural birth date; death date known to within two years]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The headings for these entities used to be established in the Ssubject file, often in 150. The records are gradually being updated and transferred to the Names file, but there is a long way to go, so you should check both files. If you only find a Subject authority, or if you need a new Name authority, please ask BMAC for help, because this is an unsettled area.

22 An example in 19.2.1.3 lists ‘Snoopy, Dr.’ as first creator, and this is generally understood to imply that Dr. Snoopy might be main entry. Charles Schulz, the real creator, is also in the creator list, even though the resource presents him merely as illustrator.
In 16a, see 1f above.

3.3 AAPs for families [RDA 10]

See 1f, above.

3.4 AAPs for corporate bodies, including placenames representing jurisdictions [RDA 11 & 16]

- The body’s ‘preferred’ name and version of name is normally (except in the case of placenames) based on the term(s) by which that body is normally presented, on the evidence of the preferred sources in resources associated with that person, then other formal statements in such resources and then other sources, e.g. reference sources.
  - If the evidence is inconclusive, choose the briefest distinctive form of the name (e.g. ‘Euratom’, not ‘European Atomic Energy Community’).
  - If reference sources in the body’s own language frequently use a well-established conventional name, prefer that (e.g. ‘Museum of Childhood’, not ‘V&A Museum of Childhood at Bethnal Green’).

- Numbers and abbreviations which form part of the name itself are transcribed as found on the sources. However, in qualifiers the familiar placename abbreviations from AACR2 are still used.
  - X10 1_ $aEmerald (Qld.)
  - X10 1_ $aTampa (Fla.)
  - X10 2_ $aNational Gallery of Art (U.S.)
  - X11 2_ $aWashington State Potato Conference$n(48th :$d2009 :$cKennewick, Wa.)

- Conference names
  - These no longer have to include a term meaning ‘meeting’; but you will need to add ‘(Conference)’ if the name does not convey the idea of a corporate body or if it consists only of an acronym.
  - X11 2_ $a Freedom & Faith (Conference)$d(1984 :$cSaint Charles, Ill.)
  - They do not have to be found in the resource
  - For series of conferences, it is now possible to create access points both for the series as a whole and for the individual conferences; the former would be used for publications consisting of...
materials from a number of conferences in the series, the latter for publications of materials from a single conference.

- If an individual conference has a distinctive name, use that name rather than the name of the conference series (e.g. 'Symposium on Protein Metabolism' rather than 'Nutrition Symposium 1953')

- Conference qualifiers may include any number of locations. ‘Online’ is used as the location for online conferences.

\[ \text{X11 2$_a$Conference on the Appalachian Frontier}$d(1985 :$cJames Maddison University; Mary Baldwin College) \]

\[ \text{X11 2$_a$Conference on the Final Frontier}$d(2012 :$cOnline) \]

- Placenames may still be qualified by jurisdiction types, e.g. ‘Wexford (Ireland : County)’, but not now by ‘City’ or ‘Town’. There may still be some NACO records which use ‘Town’ as a qualifier, and you should still use these in bibliographic records (but tell BMAC); but you should not use them as models if you are creating new access points.

- Relator terms are added if a suitable one is available (see 1e, above)

### 3.5 AAPs for works and expressions, including series [RDA 6]

- There have been quite a number of changes of detail affecting the choice of individuating qualifiers for works and expressions, but if an important or complicated AAP is needed it is best to refer it to BMAC for NACO work. In ordinary bibliographic cataloguing you can continue to:

  - individuate works by genre and/or date and/or associated person, in parentheses
    
    \[ \text{X30 0$_a$Romeo and Juliet (Choreographic work : Balanchine and Nijinska)} \]
    
    \[ \text{X30 0$_a$Romeo and Juliet (Choreographic work : Macmillan)} \]
    
    \[ \text{X30 0$_a$Romeo and Juliet (Motion picture : 1936)} \]
    
    \[ \text{X30 0$_a$Romeo and Juliet (Motion picture : 1968)} \]

  - individuate expressions by language and/or (for complete or collected works) date, in separate subfields.

\[ 100 0$_a$Virgil,$eauthor. \]
\[ 240 10$aAeneis.$kSelections.$lEnglish \]
\[ 700 1$_a$Yeats, W. B.$q(William Butler),$d1865-1939.$tWorks.$f1913. \]

- The most important changes are:

  - There is less tidying up of titles, so integrated statements of responsibility are no longer omitted; but alternative titles and other title information are still omitted.

\[ 490 1$_a$Rosie Redd’s Bible stories \]
\[ 800 1$_a$Rosie, Rosie.$tRosie Redd’s Bible stories. \]

- Collected works in various genres by a single creator no longer get the conventional title ‘Selections’. Instead you should use ‘Works. Selections’.

---

23 In fact, for RDA some expression-level qualifiers are entered in parentheses, just like work-level qualifiers; but again this is an issue for NACO cataloguers and does not affect the small range of qualifiers commonly used by bibliographic cataloguers.
- Complete and collected works in a single genre always use the specific genre as their title (i.e., in subfield $t$) rather than ‘Works’, even if the creator did not work in any other genre.

- If there is a language subfield, this always comes after ‘Selections’, because ‘Selections’ is part of the access point for the work, while language subfields are expression-level add-ons.

```
700 12 $aYeats, W. B.$q(William Butler),$d1865-1939.$tWorks.$kSelections.$lFrench.
700 0_ $aAeschylus.$tPlays.$kSelections.$lEnglish.
```

- Abridgements are considered to be versions of the original, so are new expressions rather than separate works. If the record requires a 130 or 240 it will therefore be the ordinary one for the complete work, without ‘Selections’. If no NACO record exists for the work, you may add ‘.$sAbridgement’ (after the language subfield, if there is one); but if the version is an important one it is best to ask BMAC to create a NACO record.24

3.6 Choice of main and added entries

RDA claims to have moved beyond the distinction between main and added entries, because this is associated with card-type catalogues, where each access point has to have its own card but the full description is usually only on the main card.

However FRBR’s WEMI hierarchy of linked records depends on being able to make and display links to works, expressions and manifestations in a concise way. For works and expressions this is usually achieved just as it was under AACR2, by creating access points consisting of the the work's first-listed or principal creator (if any), the original or best-known title of the work, and any necessary individuating qualifiers. For instance, a FRBR manifestation-level record for a particular publication of a Latin translation of Alice in Wonderland would need to have an access point linking it to the expression-level record for that translation, and this access point would take the form

```
Carroll, Lewis, 1832-1898. Alice's adventures in Wonderland. Latin
```

The expression-level record would in its turn have an access point linking it to the work-level record, which would take the form

```
Carroll, Lewis, 1832-1898. Alice's adventures in Wonderland
```

So, far from moving beyond the distinction between main and added entries, RDA enshrines the idea that, for the sake of identifying works, one creator25 of each work (if it has creators) and one of its titles should be privileged above all other creators and titles; and the rules for this are in most cases exactly the same as the AACR2 rules for main entry.

This is mainly good news, because it means that RDA does still offer rules for what to put in MARC 1XX fields. The bad news is that these rules are buried in sections about how to create AAPs for works and expressions [6.27 ff.] and about what kind of input justifies treating an entity as a creator [19.2-3].

Here are the changes you need to know about:

---

24 This also means that statements such as ‘Abridged’ on the resource should be treated as edition statements.

25 There are in fact a couple of cases (bodies issuing laws and liturgies) where RDA specifies that the bodies should be the first elements of the access points for the work but nevertheless classifies the bodies as 'other corporate body associated with the work’ rather than as ‘creator’. In MARC cataloguing the only importance of this anomaly is that if you want to give such a body a relator term you should take a term from the 'other’ list in Appendix I rather than the ‘creator’ list.
3.6a Corporate bodies as artists

- If two or more artists act as a corporate body, the artistic works they produce are entered under that body.

  110 2_ $a$Seekers of Lice (Artistic group)
  245 1_ $aQuandries.$n

3.6b Collaborations

- Because the 'Rule of 3' has been abandoned, the principal or first-listed creator (if any) should be main entry no matter how many collaborators there are.

- A work is collaborative if more than one entity has input into its primary intellectual/artistic content, whether or not the entities have the same kind of input. For instance, the primary content of a musical requires input from both a composer and a lyricist, and the primary content of a graphic novel requires input from both an author and an artist. RDA is quite generous in recognising creative input. For instance, if a work is ghostwritten, both the ghostwriter and the ‘ideas’ person are counted as creators. (Both would have the relator ‘author’ because both types of input, although different, meet the definition for ‘author’.)

- It is important to check that what you have really is a collaboration. Sometimes the people or bodies listed on the preferred source turn out to be responsible for separate parts of the resource, which means that the resource should be treated as a compilation (see below). Please check contents pages to find out whether different parts have different creators, but disregard expression-level contributions such as introductions, notes, illustrations and appendices. In case of doubt, treat the work as a collaboration.

3.6c Compilations

- Compilations of multiple works or expressions with different creators are always entered under title,\(^{26}\) with analytical entries for the component works if they are substantial. (Under AACR2 rules, compilations by different authors without a collective title were given the main entry appropriate to the first work.)

  245 00 $a$Jane Eyre /$c$Charlotte Brontë. Wuthering Heights / Emily Brontë. The tenant of Wildfell Hall / Ann Brontë ; [all] illustrated by Jane White.
  700 12 $a$Bronte, Charlotte,$d$1816-1855.$t$Jane Eyre.$n
  700 12 $a$Bronte, Emily,$d$1818-1848.$t$Wuthering Heights.$n
  700 12 $a$Bronte, Ann,$d$1820-1849.$t$Tenant of Wildfell Hall.$n
  700 1_ $a$White, Jane,$e$illustrator.$n

- If such a compilation has been published previously under a different title, the main entry will be the AAP for the compilation, in a 130 field, rather than the title proper in the 245 field.

  130 0_ $a$Favourite Bronte novels.$n
  245 10 $a$Jane Eyre /$c$Charlotte Brontë. Wuthering Heights / Emily Brontë. The tenant of Wildfell Hall / Ann Brontë ; [all] illustrated by Jane White.$n
  500 __ $a$Previously published as: Favourite Bronte novels. 1950.$n
  700 12 $a$Bronte, Charlotte,$d$1816-1855.$t$Jane Eyre.$n
  700 12 $a$Bronte, Emily,$d$1818-1848.$t$Wuthering Heights.$n
  700 12 $a$Bronte, Ann,$d$1820-1849.$t$Tenant of Wildfell Hall.$n
  700 1_ $a$White, Jane,$e$illustrator.$n

\(^{26}\) But remember that the ‘creator’ of a text is not always its writer. For instance, the creator of a museum catalogue is the museum, and the creator of conference papers is the conference.
• **Compilations of works or expressions by a single creator** are entered under that creator, with a generic title for the compilation in field 240 and analytical entries for the individual works if they have distinctive titles and are substantial.  

(Under AACR2 rules, if there were only two works the first was recorded in 240 and only the second had an analytical entry.)

```
100 1_ $aBlyton, Enid,$eauthor.
240 10 $aNovels.$kSelections
245 10 $aTwo classic Enid Blyton stories.
505 0_ $aFive get into a fix -- The Adventurous Four again.
700 12 $aBlyton, Enid.$tFive get into a fix.
700 12 $aBlyton, Enid.$tAdventurous Four again.
```

• If a resource embodies **versions of the same work in different languages** it is considered as a compilation of multiple expressions, and each is given an analytical entry with the appropriate language element.  

(Under AACR2 rules, the versions were given a single access point in 130 or 1XX+240, with a single language element to cover all the languages, e.g. ‘English & Greek’ or ‘Polyglot’.)

```
100 0_ $aVirgil,$eauthor.
245 10 $aVirgil’s Aeneid /$cwith new translations by John Brown and Giovanni Bruno.
546 __ $aLatin text with parallel English and Italian translations.
700 02 $aVirgil.$tAeneis.
700 02 $aVirgil.$tAeneis.$lEnglish.
700 02 $aVirgil.$tAeneis.$lItalian.
```

• For compilations of substantial, titled components, only the first analytical entry is core for RDA. If you download records which lack analytical entries for some of their substantial, titled components, please add these.

3.6d **Revisions, corrected editions, etc.**

• One of the major differences between AACR2 and RDA is that, whereas AACR2 treated every revision as a new work based on the earlier edition, on FRBR principles many revisions and new editions are new expressions of the same work.

• If various issues are expressions of the same work, they must have the same main entry and title. This is because the main entry and title together constitute the AAP for that work, and the AAP is what FRBR-compliant library systems of the future will use to cluster records. Sometimes this means that the choice of main entry has to be based not on the resource in hand but on an earlier issue.

• However, if a work is **radically revised** or if a new issue has **different creators** from a previous issue (not just the same creators in a different order) the result is a new work, and so the choice of main entry should be based just on the new issue. (Different creators mean a new work because a FRBR work-level record would include links to the work’s creators, and different links would require a different record.)

---

27 But bear in mind the OLIS guideline that we seldom make more than 10 analytical entries; if a multipart set requires more, the parts should probably have separate records. See Module 6: Bibliographic records for multiparts, 6.2 (i).

28 If one of the versions is in the original language, it does not need a language subfield.
• In AACR2 cataloguing we usually made notes and added entries only for the immediately previous edition or issue. But, because in RDA the previous edition and the previous work are not necessarily the same thing, it will sometimes be helpful to make rather more notes and added entries to help users find resources and understand the relationships between them.

• For instance: if the 1st edition of *Brain surgery for beginners* had as its authors John Brown and James Grey (listed in that order), the main entry would be the AAP for John Brown, just as in AACR2.

```
on t.p.
John Brown and James Grey
Basic techniques for first-year students
Brain Surgery for Beginners
1950
```

100 1_ $aBrown, John,$d1920-$eauthor.
245 10 $aBrain surgery for beginners :$bbasic techniques for first-year students /$cJohn Brown and James Grey.
700 1_ $aGrey, James,$d1922-$eauthor.

• But if the 2nd edition had a **change of order in the statement of responsibility**, with James Grey listed first, it would just be a different expression of the same work, so *John Brown should remain as main entry*. This will ensure that the records for the first and second editions cluster together.

```
on t.p.
Brain Surgery for Beginners
Basic techniques for first-year students
James Grey
John Brown
2nd edition
1960
```

100 1_ $aBrown, John,$d1920-$eauthor.
245 10 $aBrain surgery for beginners :$bbasic techniques for first-year students /$cJames Grey, John Brown.
250 __ $a2nd edition.
500 __ $aPrevious edition: 1950.
700 1 $aGrey, James,$d1922-$eauthor.

• However, if the 3rd edition had an **addition to the list of persons presented as authors**, i.e., as creators, that would be a **work-level** change.²⁹ A new set of creators means a new creation.
  - The main entry for this issue would therefore be the creator listed first on it, disregarding earlier issues. As a result, a FRBR-compliant system would not cluster this edition with the earlier ones.
  - The record would need a 7XX entry for the earlier work.

---
²⁹ This follows BL decisions and examples, but there is some uncertainty in this area and some LC training material suggests that they would consider a change in authorship as work-level only if the first-listed original author was no longer listed at all. That would imply that the contributions of the new people joining the team were normally regarded as merely expression-level, with the consequence that they could be assigned only expression-level relator terms, e.g. ‘editor’ or ‘writer of added text’. However, it would be very burdensome for cataloguers to have to work out in every case which team members should have work-level relators and which should have only expression-level relators, so it is simplest to assume that all the members of a team presented as creators have the same level of responsibility.
on t.p.
Brain Surgery for Beginners
Basic techniques for first-year students
James Grey
Joan White
John Brown
3rd edition
1970

- If the 4th edition had a **new title but no change of authors or radical revision**, it would just be a **new expression** again. It would therefore need to have the same main entry and title as the 3rd edition.
  - James Grey would remain as main entry, even though on this edition Joan White is listed above him.
  - The record would need a 240 for the earlier title of the work, which would take precedence over 245 for purposes of FRBR clustering.
  - The record would need a note to explain the change of title.
  - It would still be useful to have the added entry and explanatory note for the earlier work.

on t.p.
Teach Yourself Brain Surgery
Basic techniques for first-year students
Joan White
James Grey
John Brown
4th edition
1980
• If the 5th edition had a separate statement of responsibility for a reviser, but there was no reason to suppose that the revision was so radical as to create a new work, the edition would just be another new expression and should still have the same main entry and title as the 3rd edition.
  - No change to 1XX, 240, their explanatory note or the added entry for the original work.
  - The statement of responsibility about the revision would go in the 250 field (as in AACR2) and the reviser’s AAP would only get the expression-level relator term, ‘editor’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100</th>
<th>$aGrey, James,$d1952–$eauthor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>$aBrain surgery for beginners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>$aTeach yourself brain surgery : $bbasic techniques for first-year students / $cJoan White, James Grey, John Brown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>$a5th edition / $brevised by June Green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>$aWhite, Joan,$d1923–$eauthor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>$aBrown, John,$d1920–$eauthor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>$aGreen, June,$d1924–$eeditor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>$aBrown, John,$d1920–$tBrain surgery for beginners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• However, if the 5th edition had a publisher’s blurb making clear that it was a radical revision, involving “a significant degree of independent intellectual or artistic effort,” you should treat it as a new work.
  - The choice of main entry and title would depend on this edition, ignoring all previous editions. In this case June Green would be the main entry, although her statement of responsibility would remain in 250, because it relates to the edition statement.
  - The record should have a 7XX related entry for the immediately previous work, i.e., the one that began with the 3rd edition, constructed from the main entry and title of that edition.
  - The record would also benefit from a note about the immediately previous edition (the 4th edition), because otherwise people might assume that the 3rd edition details were those of the immediately previous edition.
  - It would still be helpful to include a related entry and explanatory note for the original work (the 1st edition), although this does make for rather a lot of notes and related entries. As a rule of thumb, if you have the information available you should consider making AAPs for the previous work and/or the original work if they have different 1XX or different 240 from the current record or they have no 240 but have different 245; and you should make notes to explain the AAPs and also to mention the previous issue if that does not have an AAP.
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on t.p.
Teach Yourself Brain Surgery
Basic techniques for first-year students
Joan White
James Grey
John Brown
5th edition
revised by June Green
1990
on back cover
June Green has comprehensively rewritten this standard textbook and added three new chapters to bring it into line with current best practice.

100 1_ $aGreen, June,$d1924-$eauthor.
245 10 $aTeach yourself brain surgery:$bbasic techniques for first-year students /$cJoan White, James Grey, John Brown.
250 __ $a5th edition /$brevised by June Green.
500 __ $a"June Green has comprehensively rewritten this standard textbook and added three new chapters to bring it into line with current best practice"--Back cover.
500 __ $aOriginal edition published as: Brain surgery for beginners : basic techniques for first-year students / John Brown, James Grey. 1950.
700 1_ $aGrey, James,$d1922-$eauthor.
700 1_ $aWhite, Joan,$d1923-$eauthor.
700 1_ $aBrown, John,$d1920-$eauthor.
700 1_ $aGrey, James,$d1922-$tBrain surgery for beginners.
700 1_ $aBrown, John,$d1920-$tBrain surgery for beginners.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

Don’t panic.

You will never come across anything which goes through so many problematic changes within 5 editions. Quite often you will not have any information about previous issues, in which case you should just base your decisions on the information as presented in the resource in hand.

Although strictly speaking FRBR requires a new work-cluster whenever there is a change of creators or a radical revision, we do not generally recommend bothering about this unless the issue would, if treated as a new work, have a really distinctive access point, i.e., a different main entry or a different title would be used for clustering. Without such a difference you would have to differentiate the works by adding parenthetical qualifiers (usually dates - see Module 3, 3.2.2d). It is unlikely that all cataloguers would have enough information to use access points differentiated in this way consistently; and catalogue users tend to like all editions with the same title and first creator to cluster together anyway, even if some of them are fairly radically revised.
You should consider starting a new work-cluster for a radical revision with the same title and same main entry only if you are confident that users would expect this, which is most often the case with literature, art, music, etc., e.g. a very new choreography for a ballet, or a reworking of a novel with a very different period or place setting.

You are not expected to investigate whether a new issue has a change of title or first creator unless you have a particular reason to suspect this, usually because of a statement on the resource or because you came across an earlier issue when checking OLIS; and even then you should check only easily available and fairly reliable sources, e.g. OLIS itself, publisher’s website (if any), BNB.