MARC DISCUSSION PAPER NO.

DATE:

REVISED:

NAME: Define Subfield $4 and Subfield $e in Field 752

SOURCE: ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)

SUMMARY: This discussion paper presents the need for subfields $e (relator term) and $4 (relator code) in Field 752 (Added Entry-Hierarchical Place Name) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

KEYWORDS: Added Entry-Hierarchical Place Name; Field 752; Field 751; Subfield $e; Subfield $4.

RELATED:

STATUS/COMMENTS:

Discussion Paper: Define Subfield $4 and Subfield $e in Field 752

1. Background

Field 752 is currently defined in the Bibliographic format as follows:

> **752 - Added Entry-Hierarchical Place Name (R)**
>
> **First Indicator**
> > Undefined
> > # - Undefined
>
> **Second Indicator**
> > Undefined
> > # - Undefined
>
> **Subfield Codes**
> > $a - Country or larger entity (R)
> > $b - First-order political jurisdiction (NR)
> > $c - Intermediate political jurisdiction (R)
> > $d - City (NR)
> > $f - City subsection (R)
> > $g - Other nonjurisdictional geographic region and feature (R)
> > $h - Extraterrestrial area (R)
> > $0 - Authority record control number (R)
> > $2 - Source of heading or term (NR)

$6 - Linkage (NR)

$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

Field definition and scope

Added entry in which the entry element is a hierarchical form of place name that is related to a particular attribute of the described item, e.g., the place of publication for a rare book. For display, a dash (--) may be generated to separate the subelements of the place name, e.g., Canada -- British Columbia -- Vancouver.

This kind of added entry is assigned according to various cataloging rules to give access to a bibliographic record through a hierarchical form of a place name related to a particular attribute (e.g., for newspapers, the name of the community served; for rare books, the place of publication or printing).

Field 751 in the bibliographic format serves a similar function: an added entry in which the entry element is a geographic name in direct order (rather than the hierarchical order of field 752).

The two examples that follow are nearly equivalent:

751 ## **$a** Lyon (France), **$e** publication place.

752 ## **$a** France **$d** Lyon.

In addition to the difference in place name order -- direct versus hierarchical -- field 751 provides the following subfields, which are lacking in field 752:

$e - Relator term: Designation of the relationship between a geographic name and the described materials (e.g., event place, publication place, etc.).

$4 - Relator code: MARC code that specifies the relationship between a geographic name and the described materials. More than one relator code may be used if the geographic name has more than one function. Code from: MARC Code List for Relators.

Field 752 lacks a mechanism to specify the relationship between the place and the described materials.

This shortcoming was partially highlighted in Proposal no. 2004-07 Applying Field 752 for Different Purposes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. As outcome, field 662 was created to record hierarchical approaches to geographic coverage of items.

2. Discussion

The presence of subfield $e and subfield $4 in field 751 sets the logical precedent for definition of the same subfields in field 752. The requirements are identical. The addition of these subfields would enable us to record

a related place while making the necessary distinction between places of publication, distribution, manufacture, and production (or name of community served, for newspapers).

The need to record a place as a related entity is most prevalent in the rare materials cataloging community, where it is common practice to record a normalized place of publication, manufacture, etc. (this data complements the transcribed place in the Publication Statement, etc.). Place as related entity (beyond a place as subject) is also an important feature in the forthcoming FRBR Library Reference Model (see: "Introducing the FRBR Library Reference Model"). When this change proposed in the FRBR LRM is eventually included in RDA, use of the 752 field may increase, and a mechanism by which to record the relationship type will become all the more necessary.

MARC relator terms and codes are already established for the following:

> Distribution place [dbp]
> Manufacture place [mfp]
> Production place [prp]
> Publication place [pup]

There is not yet a MARC relator term or code to indicate the name of community served for newspapers.

3. Examples

Example 1

> **752** ## **$a** France **$d** Lyon, **$e** production place.
>
> or
>
> **752** ## **$a** France **$d** Lyon. **$4** prp

Example 2

> **752** ## **$a** England **$d** London, **$e** publication place.
> **752** ## **$a** Scotland **$d** Edinburgh, **$e** manufacture place.
>
> or
>
> **752** ## **$a** England **$d** London. **$4** pup
> **752** ## **$a** Scotland **$d** Edinburgh. **$4** mfp
>
> *In Example 2, places of publication and manufacture are recorded for a single resource.*

Example 3

752 ## **$a** United States **$b** Massachusetts **$d** Boston, **$e** publication place, **$e** distribution place.

or

752 ## **$a** United States **$b** Massachusetts **$d** Boston. **$4** pup **$4** dbp

In Example 3, subfield $e or subfield $4 is repeated to indicate that the place serves as publication place and distribution place.

4. Bibframe discussion

The impact is unclear. It appears that BIBFRAME will model providerPlace data as an element distinct from the place that is recorded as part of a providerStatement. Perhaps MARC 751 and 752 data will map to providerPlace. If so, then the relator indicated in subfield $e or subfield $4 will indicate whether the providerPlace data belongs to a distribution event, manufacture event, production event, or publication event.

5. Questions

Has the need for defining subfield $e (relator term) and subfield $4 (relator code) in field 752 been demonstrated in this paper?

Are there any drawbacks to defining these subfields to the field?