

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: Christine Frodl, DNB Representative  
Subject: Representing date of works and expressions in RDA: Discussion Paper

DNB thanks EURIG for preparing this Discussion paper. We think that this approach might be good and reasonable for specific genres of works and also for museums and archives.

1. Date of Expression:

We welcome the sub element „nature of date“, but we refuse to make it mandatory. We regard a distinction between “preferred” and “additional” as not really necessary. This distinction is only relevant when building the authorized access point. A short rule that says which date should be chosen for the access point would be sufficient.

2. Date of Work:

Berlioz example: We regard this as attributes of specific expressions or manifestations of the work and think that this is already covered in RDA chapters 26 and 27.

Recording the attribute (here: the year) of the related expression or manifestation is a structured description according to RDA 24.4.4.3 (“a full or partial description of the related resource using the same data that would be recorded in RDA elements for a description of that related resource”).

In those cases it would be sufficient to add appropriate relationship designators within a separate section in Appendix J, for example “earliest known publication” or “first public performance”.

There are remaining dates that can not be regarded as dates of a specific expression or manifestation, for example “Date of shooting”. Such statements belong to RDA 6.7.1 „Basic instructions on recording the history of the work“.

We assume that the time for research for the cataloguer might increase by following the approach presented in this Discussion paper.