

Re: Final Report: Final Draft-PCC Guidelines for Creating Bibliographic Records in Multiple Character sets

To: Becky Culbertson, chair, PCC Standing Committee on Standards

From: Task Force on Non-Latin Script Cataloging Documentation

Current Task Force roster:

Benjamin Abrahamse, MIT (Arabic, Hebrew)
Nora Avetyan, UCLA (Persian, some Greek)
Sharon Benamou UCLA (Hebrew, Yiddish), began Sept. 2009
Diana Brooking, Univ. of Washington (Cyrillic)
Shi Deng, UC San Diego (CJK)
Joanna Dyla, Stanford (Cyrillic)
Peter Fletcher, UCLA, chair, PCC, SCS rep. (Cyrillic)
Caroline Miller, UCLA (Hebrew/Yiddish)
Robert Rendall, Columbia (Cyrillic, some Greek, Arabic, Chinese)
Dave Reser, LC liaison
Julie Su, San Diego State (CJK)
Keiko Suzuki, Yale (CJK)
Patricia Thurston, Yale (Cyrillic)
Jiping Wu, Coop Section (formerly Coop Team) Library of Congress (CJK)

Apr. 29, 2010

Final [Guidelines for Creating Bibliographic Records in Multiple Character sets](#) [PDF: 568 KB 17 p.]

Background:

Draft charge: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/scs/PCCNonLatinTFDraftCharge.pdf> [PDF 36 KB 2 p.]

Task force Preliminary report, guidelines (including requests for feedback on specific issues):
<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/scs/Non-Latin-TF-Prelim-Report-Guidelines.pdf> [PDF 184 KB 13 p.]
Many useful suggestions from the feedback have been incorporated into the guidelines.

Current BIBCO core record standard for multiple character sets:

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/coreintro.html#9>

Applicable practice from this document has been preserved in these guidelines.

Some conclusions, rationales, considerations:

- Making documentation more easily available: One of the driving forces for creating these guidelines was simply to make such documentation more available to catalogers, especially catalogers new to adding non-Latin script to bibliographic records. The current PCC documentation is either not comprehensive or applies only to CJK and Arabic serials (CEG, appendices O and E respectively), and is not easy to find. If these comprehensive guidelines are made more widely available, they will encourage the inclusion of non-Latin characters in bibliographic records across formats and for all available scripts (currently MARC-8 repertoire of UTF-8).

- Sharing information about practices in different communities: This documentation, which is intended to be updated regularly, can keep PCC and other catalogers informed as to how different communities deal with adding non-Latin script in catalog records.
- Rationale for Mandatory if applicable (MA) fields: descriptive fields that can be transcribed from the resource itself in the original script without any cataloger supplied data (245, 246, 250, 260, 490, 740) are listed at MA (Mandatory if applicable). In the BSR (BIBCO Standard Record, presently for print monographs), all of these fields are either M (Mandatory) or A (Mandatory if applicable). In these guidelines, MA means that a parallel field is required if a field containing romanized text is present, not that the presence of the MARC field itself is required if applicable.
- Rational for optional practices (headings)
 - One size does not fit all: Consistent practice across scripts is preferable whenever possible. However, in constructing guidelines of this nature, there must be recognition of the diversity of the languages and scripts catalogers work with. Current practice in particular communities does not always conform to the strict guidelines for constructing parallel, non-Latin headings given for Arabic and CJK in the CONSER Editing Guide (and in section 2.5 of these guidelines). The task force feels it is important to recognize and allow for alternate practices (in section 2.5.2) that these communities have found necessary, so that they will be able to operate within these guidelines and participate in their future development. Thus some options are given for constructing parallel non-Latin headings, and there are separate script/language sections in the document which include either special practice required for a particular script (including some reminders of typical pitfalls to be aware of), or other special or optional practices that a particular community considers useful for the catalog user.
 - Variant, uncontrolled heading: The parallel original script headings permitted under these guidelines are not under authority control and thus some flexibility in adding non-Latin data seems appropriate.
 - To encourage more original script in bibliographic records: There is a general assumption that more original script in cataloging records enhances access. Some of the rationale behind this is as follows:
 - Transliteration, while helpful for our indexing capabilities within our ILS, can be a barrier to access: native speakers may not be aware of our transliteration standards and thus be unable to locate sought after items with records in our catalogs that do not have original script.
 - Non-standard transliteration using different transliteration schemes or different interpretations of the standard scheme may be entered in the catalog by catalogers or acquisitions staff responsible for initial ILS input. This can result in researchers not locating library resources otherwise readily available, or resources being re-ordered because they could not be found in the catalog. The presence of original script in the record removes the need to account for variant transliterations when searching.
- Language/script of heading vs. language/script of resource being cataloged: These guidelines assume that parallel non-Latin data for a heading will be supplied in the language and script of the heading. However, several members of the task force noted that some catalogers, particularly in the HAPY community of practice, provide parallel data for a heading in the language of the resource being cataloged, regardless of the language/script associated with the heading. For example, for a Yiddish translation of a Russian work by Dostoyevsky, the non-Latin parallel data for both a uniform title and the name heading for Dostoevsky would be rendered in Yiddish/Hebrew script instead of Russian/Cyrillic. Should catalogers always supply

parallel non-Latin data for a heading in the language and script of the heading, or is it permissible (or useful) to use the language and script that appear on the resource being cataloged? The task force did not reach consensus on this matter but believes it is an issue that PCC should be aware of and may wish to address and form a policy.

- Mechanism for regular updating of guidelines: The task force recommends that PCC members have a means of contacting the chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards (or other appropriate contact PCC may designate) with requests for revisions, updates, additional sections, etc. It is important that these guidelines be easily and efficiently updated whenever required, since new scripts will be added in the future and various cataloging communities are developing best practices that these guidelines could incorporate. The revision mechanism selected should be described in the final text of the guidelines. Presently, Appendix B. of the guidelines describes a possible procedure for updating.
- Future authority control of non-Latin headings: The optional parallel non-Latin heading fields permitted under these guidelines are essentially variant headings and are not under authority control. Although even these uncontrolled forms may enhance access to bibliographic records, the task force believes it would be advantageous to eventually have headings authorized and established in their original script forms. Thus the task force recommends that the PCC, along with appropriate partnerships (Library of Congress, ALA, other cataloging communities, etc.), pursue options that would allow catalogers to establish names in original script, either in a separate authority record or in a designated field within the authority record for the Latin-script heading. It should be pointed out that in most cases] PCC catalogers essentially already establish non-Latin names in their original language and script based on resources published in these languages/scripts, but then record this established form in romanization only in the 1XX field of the authority record. An established practice for the addition of qualifiers, dates, etc., would also need to be formulated.