

# Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

5JSC/LC rep/2

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA      DATE: April 11, 2008  
FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative  
SUBJECT: RDA draft chapter 6: selected topics on naming the work

This paper includes comments and recommendations related to the three situations of naming works listed below. LC did include comments on originating bodies in its response to the draft chapters included in the recent review of sections 2-4, 9; the section here on originating bodies is more complete. LC did not include comments on the other two situations in its response to the draft chapters.

1. Originating bodies
2. Collaborative works: “principal responsibility”
3. Different identities for the same work

=====

## **1. Originating bodies**

The AACR2 concept of emanating body in rule 21.1B2 has two aspects:

- It provides the only possibilities in AACR2 for including the corporate body when naming a work.
- It is applied based on the type of resource with any mode of issuance, not just the role of the body.

RDA is not consistent in including this AACR2 concept: is not included in ch. 6 (naming the work) but is included in chapter. 19 (corporate bodies associated with the work).

Choice A: If the JSC intends to include the AACR2 21.1B2 concept of emanating bodies as the “originating body” concept in RDA (to foster interoperability with AACR2 records), LC recommends that the following actions be taken in RDA draft chapters:

#1: Add “originating body” as a separate instruction in chapter. 6 after 6.1.1.1. Include a reference to 6.1.1.1.1 if there is a person as creator or to 6.1.1.6 if there is not a person as creator (comparable to AACR2 21.1C1, paragraph c); revise 6.1.1.6 to cover the latter situation.

#2: Define creator as being only persons or families; remove corporate bodies

(including bodies such as conferences and expeditions) as creators from 6.1.1.1 and from 6.1.1.2.

#3: Create a special category of creator in 6.1.1.1.1 for performing groups even though they are corporate bodies. (Such performing groups are an anomaly in the AACR2 21.1B2 categories because they are included due to their role rather than just the type of resource.) LC would recommend considering them to be a special category of creator rather than reinstating them as originating bodies.

#4: Remove the serials exception in 6.1.1.2 because it contradicts the originating-body categories.

#5: Revise 6.1.1.1.2 to include the situation when there is no creator (comparable to AACR2 21.1C1, paragraph a)) revise 6.1.1.6 to cover the same situation.

#6: Revise the 19.3 originating body instruction to cover situations when there are multiple originating bodies.

#7: Revise 19.2 to remove corporate bodies; note that the Northern Pacific Railway Company and the Asahel Curtis Photo Co. examples on p. 19-6 appear to be originating-body situations; the American Geological Institute is not an originating-body situation. (Decision on recommendation #3 above will affect scope of revision here; if performing groups are retained in 6.1.1.1.1, they could be included in 19.2 or covered by a new separate instruction, e.g., 19.4 .)

#8: Review all examples where a corporate body is used in naming the work and delete the body's name if the resource doesn't represent an originating-body situation.

Choice B: If the JSC wants to name the work based on the role of the entity involved and not the type of resource (i.e., not carry the concept of emanating body from AACR2 into RDA), LC recommends that the following actions be taken in RDA draft chapters:

#9: Delete the 19.3 originating body instruction.

#10: Decide which corporate bodies can be creators. Not all the emanating bodies (e.g., conferences, expeditions) seem to be creators.

#11: Delete the serials exception in 6.1.1.2 because it contradicts the principle of the role of the corporate body.

#12: Revise 6.1.1.1.2 to include the situation when there is no creator; revise 6.1.1.6 to cover the same situation.

#13: Review all examples where a corporate body is used in naming the work and delete the body's name if the resource represents an originating-body situations instead of a body-as-creator situation.

Making this decision will result in these changes from current situation:

- a) Many more works will be named by corporate body + preferred title (e.g., a journal issued by a society; a monographic series issued by a university department; the dictionary example on p. 19-6)
- b) Because more serials will be named by corporate body + preferred title, it will be necessary much more often to create a new description for a serial

because the responsibility has changed (see 1.6) unless the JSC decides to change from successive-entry descriptions to earliest-entry descriptions.

- c) Those works of official statements of position, often prepared by another body for the emanating body, would now be named by the preparing body.\*
- d) Those works now prepared by a subordinate body of the emanating body would be named by the subordinate body + preferred title. (Naming by the parent body is covered by an LCRI after the deletion of 21.1B4 in the 1998 revision of AACR2; the deleted rule said to name by the subordinate body if it was stated prominently.)\*

\* It is likely that these two categories would be proposed by cataloguing agencies as exceptions to the general instruction because they or their users don't like the results (concept of emanating/originating body would "creep" back into RDA or at least into documentation for implementing RDA).

## **2. Collaborative works: "principal responsibility"**

RDA 6.1.1.2.1a:

If the work is presented as a collaboration between two or more creators, construct the preferred access point combining (in this order):

- a) the preferred access point for the person, family, or corporate body named first in resources embodying ...
- b) the preferred title for the work, formulated according ...

The AACR2 21.6B concept of principal responsibility (such responsibility indicated "by the wording or the layout" on the source) is lacking in RDA. LC agrees that choosing the first-named person, family, or corporate body is a simplification. However, the result for some works is that the name of those works will not reflect the truth about the creation of those works.

-- Multiple creators performing the same function

If the other-than-first-named entity contributed more than half the effort, is it truthful to name the work by using the name of a different entity?

Made-up example:

Smith, Suzanne. *Primer on microeconomics*  
(*Suzanne Smith* (chapter 1); *Professor Harold Bloom* (ch. 2-10))

-- Multiple creators performing different functions

If the presentation of the creators' names is based on something other than degree of responsibility (e.g., names presented in alphabetical order), is it truthful to name the work by using the first-named entity?

Modified example from 6.1.1.2.1:

Brousseau, Pat. Quitter

(*Pat Brousseau*, letters; *Dean Haspiel*, artist; *Lee Loughridge*, gray tones; *Harvey Pekar*, writer)

Recommendations:

#14: Revise 6.1.1.2.1 to reflect principal responsibility before first-named responsibility.

#15: Modify 6.1.1.2.7 (“If there is no consistency in the order in which the collaborators are named ... preferred access point for the person, family, or corporate body named first in the first resource received ...”) to apply only when principal responsibility is not indicated.

### **3. Different identities for the same work**

RDA 9.2.4 indicates that the name used with an identity should be chosen for that identity. What is not present in chapter 6 is the identity counterpart to the 6.1.1.2.7 instruction about inconsistency in manifestations of the work. Wording similar to a paragraph in AACR2 22.2B3 was included in an editor’s draft of chapter 9; because it addressed naming the work, it was removed from chapter 9 but wasn’t included in chapter 6.

Recommendation:

#16: Add an instruction at 6.1.1.1 using the AACR2 22.2B3 wording as the basis.

AACR2: “If, in the works of contemporary authors, different names appear in different editions of the same work or two or more names appear in one edition, choose, for all editions, the name most frequently used in editions of the work. If that cannot be determined readily, choose the name appearing in the latest available edition of the work.”

Possible wording modeled on 6.1.1.2.7:

If there is no consistency in the identity (see 9.2.4) used on the resource, construct the preferred access point representing the work using the preferred access point for the identity most frequently used on resources followed by the preferred title for the work. If the identity used most frequently cannot be determined readily, use the preferred access point for the identity appearing in the latest resource followed by the preferred title for the work.