

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Using the mark of omission when recording titles (RDA 6.2)

We thank ALA for analyzing the situation with the omission of words, dates, numbers, names, etc., that vary from issue to issue of a serial, etc. However, we are not convinced that a general rule is necessary in chapter 6. We do not support the majority of ALA's proposed revisions to chapter 6, but we would like to suggest a change to 2.3.1.4—the inclusion of multipart monographs in the exceptions.

It was noted in the proposal that AACR2 had codified the practice of omitting the varying information, but this AACR2 instruction (12.1B7) applied to the recording of the *title proper* and is already represented appropriately in the title proper instructions in RDA (2.3.1.4). We believe that it was not necessary in AACR2 chapter 25, and not necessary in RDA chapter 6, because of the instructions already present in RDA chapter 6 to use titles from resources embodying the work, the title proper of the original edition, etc. We believe this general connection to the title instructions in chapter 2 already solves any cataloguer's questions about choosing the preferred title when information that varies from issue to issue, just as it applies to abridged titles, introductory words, inaccuracies, titles that contain names, etc., mentioned in 2.3.1.4-2.3.1.6.

We would agree to add one of the examples proposed by ALA to be added to the second example box of existing 6.2.2.4 to reinforce this connection:

Publication ... of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics
Source of information reads: Publication twenty-five of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics

We do not agree with the proposed exception to omit initial marks of omission when recording titles of works. The current practice to record the marks of omission as part of the preferred title is consistent with the instruction at 2.3.1.4 for recording the titles of the manifestation, which are often the basis for the preferred title for the work. This change from AACR2 practice was a conscious decision, and we see no principled reason to restore the exception in RDA. [ALA had noted that this concept had not been unanimously endorsed.] If the JSC wishes to approve this concept, it cannot be added to chapter 6 without also changing the exception at 2.3.1.4.

ALA did note that the 2.3.1.4 third exception should apply to multipart monographs as well as serials—we concur that this is an oversight that should be corrected, and hope that the JSC would agree to this minor changes at this time (or as a future Fast Track):

2.3.1.4, Third Exception (remainder of text unchanged; new example proposed)

Date, name, number, etc., that varies from issue to issue. If a title of a serial or multipart monograph includes a date, name, number, etc., that varies from issue to issue, omit this date, name, number, etc. Use a mark of omission (...) to indicate such an omission.

We suggest a new final example for a multipart monograph be added to the existing example set following the third exception:

Operis elementaris pars ...

Source of information reads: Operis elementaris pars prima. **A four-volume multipart monograph**