**To:** Casey Mullin, Chair, ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies (SSFV)

**From:** Amanda Ros, Chair, ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

**Subject:** CC:DA Response to “Best Practices for Recording Faceted Chronological Data in Bibliographic Records”

Thank you for the opportunity for CC:DA to review and respond to your report, *Best Practices for Recording Faceted Chronological Data in Bibliographic Records*. Overall this was a thoughtful report with thorough description of related fields, clear recommendations for their use, and plenty of illustrative examples.

We agree that “the justification for the development of enhanced functionality around faceted data in general requires a critical mass of faceted data to be present in the bibliographic records within a given discovery environment”, and look forward to future guidance for enhancing legacy bibliographic and authority records. We can also see the utility of the suggested MARC 046 subfields (both subfield $3 and additional subfields for dates relating to the expression) and look forward to those proposals as well.

Our concerns and suggestions are described in the sections below:

**Collection Aggregates**

RDA is flexible and does not require catalogers to describe all aggregated works; instead, any or all aggregated works may be described according to cataloger judgment. The best practices do not offer this same level of flexibility in recording creation dates for aggregated works in field 046. Instead, it is stated on page 18 that “specific dates may be given for all works in an aggregate when these are known and deemed to be useful.” There is no option within the best practices to record creation dates for some works in an aggregate, even if those dates are bibliographically significant or would improve discoverability. To support recording more faceted chronological data in bibliographic records, the best practices should allow for more flexibility; in general, recording the creation date for a single aggregated work would be better than not recording any creation dates. If it is important to record creation dates for all and not just some aggregated works in an aggregate, either collectively or separately, this should be explained in the best practices.

The best practices recommend using 046 $o and $p to record creation dates for single works in an aggregate. This practice differs from the examples included in [MARC Proposal No. 2013-07: Defining Encoding Elements to Record Chronological Categories and Dates of Works and Expressions](https://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2013/2013-07.html), as well as OLAC’s [Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs](https://www.olacinc.org/sites/default/files/DVD_Blu-ray-RDA-Guide-Version-1-1-final-aug2018-rev-1.pdf) (p. 55-56). In both cases, 046 $k and $l are used to record creation dates of single works regardless of whether or not they are included in an aggregate.

An example from the 2013 proposal defining $o and $p:

046 ## $o 1988 $p 1997

046 ## $8 1\c $k 1997

046 ## $8 2\c $k 1988

700 12 $8 1\c $a Smith, Anna Deavere. $t House arrest.

700 12 $8 2\c $a Smith, Anna Deavere. $t Piano.

*(a book containing two plays)*

An example from the OLAC best practices:

046 $k 1932 $2 edtf

046 $k 1935 $2 edtf

046 $k 1940 $2 edtf

500 $a Originally released 1932-1940.

*(3-DVD set of films originally released 1932, 1935, 1940)*

While the MARC subfield $o is named “*Single* or starting date for aggregated content”, we believe that “single” here should mean that a subfield $o would be used for an aggregate where all content was created in a single year or century (with no subfield $p needed to specify the range), not that repeated 046 $o should be used for creation dates of individual works within an aggregate.

Following the practice in the MARC proposal and OLAC best practices would ensure that all creation dates of single works are always coded in 046 $k and $l, while 046 $o and $p would always correspond to the creation dates for multiple works in an aggregate. This practice would be easier for catalogers to implement because they would not need to determine whether or not the work is an aggregated work before coding dates in field 046. Furthermore, it could allow for increased flexibility because it would be possible to record the creation dates of all aggregated works collectively in 046 $o and $p, as well as some or all of the aggregated works separately in 046 $k and $l. Catalogers could add creation dates for aggregated works they consider bibliographically significant and later catalogers could include additional creation dates without modifying the existing data. The yet to be defined subfield $3 could be used if it is important to distinguish creation dates for the aggregating work from the aggregated works.

**Augmentation Aggregates**

There are numerous examples of augmentation aggregates throughout the best practices (see Appendix A below). In each case, the augmenting work(s) supplements the augmented or primary work(s). The augmenting works may or may not be bibliographically significant and may or may not be described in the bibliographic record. For example, *Gulliver’s travels* (page 9) was created by Jonathan Swift in 1726 and was augmented with an introduction by Colin McKelvie likely created in 1976.

The best practices do not consider augmentation aggregates as aggregates and creation dates are coded in field 046 differently than collection aggregates. For example, creation dates for aggregated works within a collection aggregate are coded in 046 $o and $p, but creation dates for a single augmented work in an augmentation aggregate are coded in 046 $k and $l.

Although it is likely that most augmenting works are not bibliographically significant to warrant description in the bibliographic record, the best practices do not provide a logical way to code creation dates for augmenting works that a cataloger considers bibliographically significant, such as an introduction or preface written by a prominent author. To be consistent with other aggregates, the cataloger could change 046 $k to $o and add a second 046 $o for the augmenting work; however, this seems strange because the resource was always an aggregate even if not all aggregated works were initially described.

However, if 046 $k is used for individual works within an aggregate (as described in the previous section), the creation date for a single augmented work within an augmentation aggregate would already be coded like other aggregated works in which the creation date of only one work was recorded. A future cataloger deciding that the augmenting work was significant could update the record by adding an additional 046 $k for the augmenting work, and optionally adding a date range for the aggregated works, without changing any of the previous coding.

If the coding practice described in the best practices is retained:

* Can field 046 be used to record creation dates for augmenting works that supplement a primary/augmented work?
* Should 046 $o and $p be used only for collection aggregates or can they be used for other types of aggregates?
* Do creation dates for different types of aggregates need to be coded differently?

**Field 046**

We had some questions about the best practices for coding of this field:

* On page 21, the best practices advise using caution when deriving field 046 from subject headings because the subject headings may be misleading or incomplete. In the example that follows, field 046 is incomplete. Is it acceptable to code 046 fields that are known to be incomplete? Can this be clarified in the best practices? (If not, what would be the correct coding for this example?)
* On page 24, *Best plays of the early American theatre : from the beginning to 1916* is coded with 046 $p 1911 (title notwithstanding). Is it acceptable to code 046 fields that may be too broad? Can this be clarified in the best practices?
* When recording date of work in field 046, it is unclear if only the year should be recorded or if a more specific date should be recorded if known. According to RDA 6.4.1.3, “For works other than treaties, generally record a date of work by giving the year or years alone.” However, the following examples include a more specific date:
  + *The story of scripture* (page 9): 046 ## $k 2016-22 $2 edtf
  + *Freedom* (page 24): 046 ## $k 1951-01 $l 1955 $2 edtf

If more specific dates are permitted, why were they not recorded in the following examples?

* *Reforming NATO's military structures* (page 7): Based on the date in the 500 note, field 046 may have been entered as: 046 ## $k 1998-05-15 $2 edtf
* *When Washington was in vogue* (page 13): Based on the dates in the 500 note, field 046 may have been entered as: 046 ## $k 1925-01 $l 1926-06 $2 edtf
* On page 4, it says “In some cases, both $k/$l and $o/$p can be used.” As a best practice, are there situations when both $k/$l and $o/$p should be used or not used or is it left up to cataloger judgment?
* Since $l indicates an end date, it seems misleading to use $l XXXX $2 edtf for a serial that has not ceased (page 24).
* On page 18, *Fifteen famous European plays* has quite a few 046 fields -- does their order in the record matter? They appear to be in the order of the work (deduplicated), but some catalogers may enter them in chronological order to make deduplication easier. We definitely see the need for an identifying subfield such as $3 on these.
* On page 26, it says “In some cases, pairing the 046 field with a 388 for time period of creation may be helpful.” In what cases is this helpful or is it left up to cataloger judgment? If a work is known to have been created during a particular period and a corresponding term is added in field 388, is there a preference for how dates should be added in field 046? In the example *Brother, can you spare a dime?* (page 26), the dates in field 046 correspond with the dates in field 388; however, in *Baroque cantatas from Gdańsk* (page 33), century dates are recorded in 046 based on the subject headings instead of the more specific dates (“about 1590 to 1750”) included in the AAT scope note.

**Field 388**

Note: Although field 388 is not included in DCM Z1, it is included in the [NACO Participants’ Manual](https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/naco/documents/NACOParticipants'Manual-20200708.pdf) (p. 58) as follows:

* The time period of creation or origin of the work or expression (including aggregate works) or of the works or expressions contained in an aggregation.
* Record dates in terms of the Gregorian calendar.

130 #0 $a Beowulf

388 1# $a Anglo-Saxon period

388 1# $a 449-1066 $2 fast $0 <http://id.worldcat.org/fast/1355931>

**Editorial Comments:**

* General:
  + For sections containing several examples in a row, consider extra spacing or some other divider between the italicized description and the following example. It can be difficult to keep track of which record the description refers to when the example section is long or spans pages.
  + Consider including at least a brief italicized description with all examples, especially *Chu ci* (page 10, as the title is non-English), but also in *Early Greek philosophy* (page 17, where the centuries are words in the note, and using EDTF for BC dates might be unfamiliar to the reader).
  + Because there are similar guidelines for different types of resources, best practices might be easier for catalogers to follow if presented based on MARC field.
* Page 3:
  + The title of SHM instruction sheet H 620 is “Chronological Headings and Subdivision**s**.”
* Page 4:
  + Because the best practices only address works and expressions, consider removing manifestations from the definition of field 046 or clearly indicate that dates associated with manifestations are beyond the scope of the document.
  + Similar to subfields $k and $l, consider including when subfields $o and $p should be used.
    - Subfield $o is used for a single date of creation of aggregated content and for the beginning date of a date range. Subfield $p is used for the ending date of a date range.
  + In the example, consider clarifying that 2002 in field 046 is the creation date of the aggregating work and should not be confused with the publication date, a manifestation element.
  + Consider reformatting so the page break does not split the example and the explanation.
  + In the note “The above dates could also be recorded in a single 046 field”, consider stating that this is because they are all encoded according to the same date scheme (not specific to EDTF).
* Pages 5-6:
  + The site linked is titled “URIs in MARC **Pilot** Resource Documents & Tools”.
  + Excellent variety of examples, including various controlled vocabularies and URIs. Consider including more examples of compilations.
  + Consider moving up the examples from page 6 to reduce the white space at the bottom of page 5.
* Page 6:
  + There is inconsistent punctuation in the bulleted list for field 045. Consider treating all bullets as complete sentences and adding final periods.
* Page 8:
  + For consistency with the other examples, indent the second line of field 245 in the *Bakuhan ishinki no kokka shihai to hō* example.
* Page 10:
  + To further demonstrate that the creation may be earlier than the publication, consider including an example showing a second or later edition and the creation date corresponding to the first edition.

**046 ## $k 1987 $2 edtf**

100 1# $a Sporre, Dennis J.

245 14 $a The creative impulse : $b an introduction to the arts / $c Dennis J. Sporre.

250 ## $a 8th ed.

260 ## $a Upper Saddle River, NJ : $b Pearson Prentice Hall, $c ©2009.

*First edition published in 1987.*

* For consistency with the other examples, indent the second line of field 245 in the *Mabādī-i ḥuqūq (bā iz̤āfāt-i jadīd)* example.
* Page 11:
  + For consistency with the other examples, bold field 046 and change \_ to # in the first indicator of field 264 in the *Viṣamapariṇayam* example.
* Page 14:
  + In the *A critical edition of John Heywood's A play of love* example, change the delimiter from ǂ to $ in field 046.
* Page 16:
  + In the *An anthology of early French organ music from the XIIth to the XVIIIth century* example, delete the second $ before subfield $a.
* Pages 19-20:
  + For consistency with the other examples, bold the subfield coding and URIs in field 388.
  + In the *A century of lyrics* example, include spacing and punctuation in “Co.$c”
* Page 21:
  + Because it is not obvious from the title that *Fever dreams* is an aggregate, consider including at least partial contents or a brief explanation.
* Page 26:
  + In the *Haiku before haiku* example:
    - Bold subfield coding and URIs in field 388.
    - Check for extra spacing before the URI for “Twenty-first century”.
    - In the explanation, change “Included” at the beginning of the second line to lowercase.
* Page 29:
  + For consistency with the other examples, bold appropriate fields (e.g., 033, 046, 500, 518).
* Page 31:
  + In *The first female detectives* example, ensure field 650 after 260 starts on a new line.
* Pages 36-39:
  + Some URLs are underlined and in blue and others are not. For consistency, ensure all URLs are presented the same way.

**Appendix A: Examples of Augmentation Aggregates**

**Examples of Augmentation Aggregates:**

* *Gulliver's travels* (page 9): primary work by Jonathan Swift; introduction by Colin McKelvie
* *Little Dorrit* (page 10): primary work by Charles Dickens; illustrations by “Phiz”; introduction by Stephen Wall
* *Cudjo's cave* (page 12): primary work by John Townsend Trowbridge; introduction by Dean Rehberger
* *When Washington was in vogue* (page 13): primary work by Edward Christopher Williams; commentaries by Adam McKible and Emily Bernard
* *The quatrain version of Gast of Gy* (page 13): anonymous primary work; foreword by Eugene J. Crook

**Examples of Collection and Augmentation Aggregates:**

* *Door wide open* (page 15): primary works by Jack Kerouac and Joyce Johnson; introduction and commentary by Joyce Johnson
* *Collected verse* (page 15): primary works by Henry Lawson; introduction and notes by Colin Roderick
* *The best American short stories of the eighties* (page 16): primary works by various creators; introduction by Shannon Ravenel
* *Fifteen famous European plays* (page 18): primary works by various creators; introduction by John Anderson
* *The Anchor anthology of Jacobean drama* (page 19): primary works by various creators; introduction, notes, and variants by Richard C. Harrier
* *Five plays* (page 23): primary works by Aphra Behn; introduced by Maureen Duffy
* *Masterpieces of music before 1750* (page 23): primary works by various creators; historical and analytical notes by Carl Parrish and John F. Ohl
* *Best plays of the early American theatre* (page 24): primary works by various creators; introductions by John Gassner in association with Mollie Gassner
* *The bold dragoon and other ghostly tales* (page 25): primary works by Washington Irving; decorative diversions by James Daugherty
* *Book of haikus* (page 25): primary works by Jack Kerouac; introduction by Regina Weinreich
* *Haiku before haiku* (page 26): primary works by various creators; introduction by Steven D. Carter
* *The first female detectives* (page 31): primary works by various creators; introduction by Dagni Bredesen