# MULTIPLE LANGUAGES, MULTIPLE SCRIPTS, AND MULTIPLE HEADINGS IN MARC AUTHORITY RECORDS

prepared by

Randall K. Barry (Internet: RBAR@LOC.GOV)

Library of Congress
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate



#### MULTIPLE LANGUAGES IN MARC

- It is common for MARC records to have data in more than one language;
- Transcribed descriptive data is generally in the language(s) of the item;
- Access points and notes are generally in the language of the catalog;
- Some libraries provide access points and notes in more than one language (examples: Canada, Switzerland)



#### LANGUAGE IDENTIFICATION IN MARC

- Language of the item (in bibliographic records);
  - 1 Code in field 008/35-37 and others in field 041;
  - Textual note in field 546;
- Language of the heading (in MARC authority format 008/35-37) was made obsolete;
- Language of catalog is coded in field 040, subfield \$b;
- No explicit field-level language flag is currently defined for MARC 21 authority or bibliographic records;



# LANGUAGE CONTEXT IN MARC AUTHORITIES

- Language of the heading has been treated as an *implicit* characteristic, and is not coded explicitly in MARC;
- The issue of an explicit context (language/nationality) code has been discussed (field-level?, record level?);
- In many countries, coding accurately for language and/or nationality would be very difficult;
- How would you code persons and entities active in several countries, and/or international agencies?



#### MULTILINGUAL MARC AUTHORITY RECORDS

- Most catalogs having headings in many languages;
- Many name authority records have tracings from different language forms;
- These include names of famous people in translation;
- Most international bodies;
- Government bodies with international scope (national foreign affairs ministries, embassies, military units);
- Catalogs of bilingual and multilingual countries.



#### LANGUAGE ASSUMPTIONS IN MARC

- The language of the catalog is not necessarily the same as the language of the items represented in it;
- Transcribed data is usually in the original language;
- Translation into the language of the catalog is provided for some data (certain names, titles, etc.);
- National and local cataloging rules govern the language of the catalog;
- Thesauri used are usually in the language of the catalog



#### LIMITATIONS OF EARLY MARC CATALOGS

- Computer hardware and software in the 20th century did not support all languages equally;
- Many computer systems had an English language bias;
- Input & retrieval interfaces were often English only;
- **Extensions to the basic Latin (Roman) alphabet were limited;**
- Support for non-Latin (non-Roman) scripts was limited



#### **EARLY SOLUTIONS**

- Fully transliterated (romanized) cataloging records;
- Preference given to non-vernacular (not original) forms of name and title;
- At best, tracings and references made from others;
- Special techniques were used to encode unusual, modified Latin script letters (using double underscore);
- Some manual catalogs were not retrospectively converted to MARC at all.



#### MULTIPLE SCRIPTS IN LIBRARIES

- Historically, many manual library catalogs included information in a variety of scripts:
  - Latin (Roman) script was very common;
  - Greek and Hebrew script was also common;
  - Arabic, Chinese, Indic, and other modern scripts could be found in larger libraries;
  - Lesser-know scripts were generally limited to their countries of origin and special libraries elsewhere.



#### MULTIPLE SCRIPTS IN MARC

- Development of the MARC formats began with Latin (Roman) script data; non-Latin data was omitted;
- The need to address non-Latin cataloging data was recognized early on;
- In 1979 a decision was made to fully transliterate non-Latin cataloging for certain languages;
- Japanese, Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian, Hebrew, & Yiddish (J-A-C-K-P-H-Y) were excluded.



#### JACKPHY AND MARC CHARACTER SETS

- Special MARC character sets were developed to support the non-Latin "JACKPHY" scripts/languages;
- "Vernacular" MARC cataloging for JACKPHY began in 1982;
- The Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) system developed a JACKPHY input/update system;
- MARC record creation was based on the "dual script" concept.



#### **EARLY MARC 8-BIT CHARACTER SETS**

- In the old "MARC-8" (8-bit) environment, only eight modern writing systems were accommodated:
  - Latin (Roman) script (for many modern languages)
  - Greek script (for modern and classical Greek)
  - Hebrew script (for Hebrew and Yiddish)
  - Arabic script (for Arabic, Persian, Urdu, etc.)
  - Cyrillic script (for Russian, Serbian, Ukrainian, etc.)
  - East Asian scripts (for Chinese, Japanese, and Korean)



#### MARC AND UNICODETM

- The MARC-8 character sets were fully mapped to Unicode in the late 1990s;
- Implementation of Unicode required coordination between many large MARC record producers;
- Most major MARC systems implemented Unicode sometime after January 2000;
- OCLC and RLIN implemented Unicode by 2004;
- The Library of Congress implemented Unicode in 2005.



#### **CURRENT MARC CHARACTER LIMITATIONS**

- MARC 21 users have been asked to limit their use of Unicode to the characters that map to MARC-8;
- In practice, many libraries have already expanded their use to many new scripts (e.g., Armenian, Thai, Indic);
- This "de facto" expansion is spreading quickly;
- The MARC community is discussing options for dealing with libraries using all of Unicode;
- Most MARC 21 systems allow full Unicode use.



#### **DUAL SCRIPT MARC RECORDS**

- Non-Latin script data is transliterated into the Latin script and transcribed in the normal MARC fields;
- This approach was compatible with the solution for non-JACKPHY scripts (Greek, Cyrillic, etc.);
- "Vernacular" script data would be repeated in separate occurrences of the MARC fields;
- Repeated data would be embedded in field 880 for ease of suppression in display and printing.



# FIELD 880 EMBEDDING TECHNIQUE

100 1[] \$6880-01\$aTheodōropoulou, Viky,\$d1958-880 1[] \$6100-01/(\$\$aΘεοδωροπούλου, Βίκυ,\$d1958-

- **↑**Field tag
  - **↑**Indicators required by corresponding data
    - **↑** Control subfield \$6
      - **↑** Variable field data
- Subfield \$6 includes the tag of the embedded field, a sequencing number, and a character set identifier.



#### MODEL A: TRANSLITERATION & VERNACULAR

- Cataloging data in the script of the catalog is recorded in the normal (non-embedded) MARC fields;
- Representation of the same data in an alternative (usually the original) script is embedded in field 880;
- Field 880 is repeated for each embedded field needed;
- Many systems cannot process data in field 880 easily;
- Currently, field 880 is used mostly for non-Latin data.



#### **EXAMPLE OF A MODEL A RECORD**

**040** [][]\$aDLC\$cDLC

066 [][]\$c(S

100 1[]\$6880-01\$aBekatōros, Stephanos,\$d1946-

400 1[]\$6880-00\$aVekatōros, Stefanos,\$d1946

880 1[]\$6100-01/(\$\$aΜπεκατώρος, Στέφανος,\$d1946-

**NOTE:** A field can be linked to nothing, in which case the sequence number in subfield \$6 is "-00".



# **ADVANTAGES OF MODEL A**

- **Easier suppression of non-Latin data in Latin script cataloging environments;**
- Clear distinctions are made between the data in different scripts (vernacular & non-vernacular);
- It is consistent with the cataloging practice for fully transliterated scripts in Latin script catalogs;
- This practice avoided the issue of repeating nonrepeatable fields, such as field 100 or field 245.



#### **DISADVANTAGES OF MODEL A**

- Marginalizes the alternative graphic representation of cataloging data, which is usually the original script;
- Field 880 embedding technique in MARC is complex;
- Linkages between non-embedded and embedded data in field 880 are difficult to input manually;
- Implementation has been limited mainly to U.S. systems (RLIN, OCLC) and never embraced by the international library (MARC user) community.



#### MODEL B: SIMPLE MULTISCRIPT RECORDS

- All data is contained in the regular MARC variable data fields;
- Whatever script is needed is used wherever needed;
- No special embedding technique is used;
- No special linkages between data in different scripts is required;
- No character set identification is made at the field level.



# **EXAMPLE OF MODEL B AUTHORITY RECORD**

- 040 [][]\$aRuMoRGB\$brus\$cRuMoRGB
- 100 1[]\$аВасниев, К. С.\$q(Каплан Сафербиевич)
- 400 1[]\$аВасниев, Каплан Сафербиевич
- 400 1[]\$aVasniev, K. S.\$q(Kaplan Saferbievich)
- 400 1[]\$aVasniev, Kaplan Saferbievich
- 670 [][]\$аКто есть кто в нефт. и газ. пром., 1992: \$b(К.С. Васниев) колофон (Каплан Сафербиер-вич Васниев; Kaplan Saferbievich Vasniev)



#### ADVANTAGES OF MODEL B

- The original (often non-Latin) script is treated equally with the alternative (usually Latin) script;
- No special field embedding must be contended with;
- Scripts can be mixed much more effectively at the field and subfield level;
- Since there are no linkages between fields, record creation and maintenance is much easier.



#### **DISADVANTAGES OF MODEL B**

- Identification and suppression of data in specific scripts is more difficult;
- Relationship between data in different scripts is not identified by explicit linkages (in subfield \$6);
- The script is not identified at the record or field level;
- It is simpler to mix scripts unwittingly within strings, sometimes using characters from one script with those of another (Greek "H", Latin "H", and Cyrillic "H")



# **CURRENT TRENDS IN MARC IMPLEMENTATIONS**

- Anglo-American libraries are continuing to create dual script records following Model A for bibliographic data only, and only for the JACKPHY scripts;
- Non-English cataloging agencies overwhelmingly prefer Model B for handling non-Latin scripts;
- A switch to Model B has been discussed and is likely to occur in Anglo-American libraries for non-JACKPHY;
- Model A is being considered for non-Latin authority data, perhaps as early as 2007 for all scripts.



#### RATIONALE FOR PREFERRING MODEL B

- Countries that use scripts other than Latin prefer the simple multiscript record approach;
- The implementation of Unicode worldwide has solved the problem of non-Latin script support in libraries;
- The use of MARC 21 field 880 is complex;
- Only a relatively small number of libraries in the U.S. currently use field 880;
- The Model B approach will be key to international cooperation in the area of authority control.



#### MULTIPLE HEADINGS IN MARC AUTHORITIES

- Most library catalogs have one authoritative form for each heading;
- Catalogs in some countries require multiple authoritative forms (bilingual/multilingual countries);
- Multiple authoritative forms are usually handled by multiple MARC authority records;
- Multiple MARC authority records are linked by See-Also Tracings or Heading Linking Entries (7XX).



#### SEE-ALSO TRACINGS TO MULTIPLE HEADINGS

- It is always possible to link between two valid authoritative forms of name with see-also tracings;
- Relationships between earlier and later forms of name are usually handled this way;
- Complex see and see-also references can also be used to relate headings;
- Tracings and references are generally used in monolingual catalogs.



#### **EXAMPLE OF SEE-ALSO TRACING METHOD**

- 010 [][]\$an 78004438
- 110 2[]\$aInternational Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
- 410 2[]\$aIFLA
- 410 2[]\$aDiethnēs Enōsē Vivliothēkonomikōn Enōseōn kai Organismōn
- 410 2[]\$αΔιεθνής Ένωση Βιβλιοθηκονομικών Ενώσεων και Οργανισμών
- 510 2[]\$wa\$aInternational Federation of Library Associations [see-also tracing from earlier name]



# EXAMPLE OF SEE-ALSO TRACING METHOD: CORRESPONDING MARC AUTHORITY RECORD

- 010 [][]\$an 81032757
- 110 2[]\$International Federation of Library Associations
- 410 2[]\$aIFLA
- 510 2[]\$wa\$aInternational Federation of Library Associations and Institutions [see-also tracing from later name]



# HEADING LINKING ENTRY TECHNIQUE

- Provides heading linkages to other authoritative forms;
- Other authoritative forms may be in separate databases (catalogs) or thesauri;
- Links may be to forms in a different language/script;
- Links may be to headings formulated according to different cataloging rules;
- Heading linking entries may duplicate forms also given as tracings or references in an authority record.



## **EXAMPLE OF A HEADING LINKING ENTRY**

- 016 [][]\$a0005G9610E
- 100 0[]\$aJohn Paul\$bII,\$cPope,\$d1920-2005
- 400 1[]\$aWojtyła, Karol Jósef,\$d1920-2005
- 400 0[]\$aJoannes Paulus\$bII,\$cPope,\$d1920-2005
- 510 2[]\$aCatholic Church.\$bPope (1978-2005:

John Paul II)\$0(CaOONL)0005G9580E

700 05\$aJean Paul\$bII,\$cpape,\$d1920-2005

\$0(CaOONL)0005G9610F

[heading linking entry to the French language form]



# EXAMPLE OF A HEADING LINKING ENTRY: CORRESPONDING MARC AUTHORITY RECORD

- 016 [][]\$a0005G9610F
- 100 0[]\$aJean Paul\$bII,\$cpape,\$d1920-2005
- 400 1[]\$aWojtyła, Karol Jósef,\$d1920-2005
- 400 0[]\$aJoannes Paulus\$bII,\$cpape,\$d1920-2005
- 510 2[]\$aÉglise catholique.\$bPape (1978-2005 :

Jean Paul II)\$0(CaOONL)0005G9580F

700 05\$aJohn Paul\$bII,\$cPope,\$d1920-2005

\$0(CaOONL)0005G9610E

[heading linking entry to the English language form]



#### LIMITATIONS OF HEADING LINKING ENTRIES

- 7XX fields contain data that can be used to provide access to alternative authoritative forms of name;
- 7XX fields do not specify how a system handles the headings they contain;
- Functionality of the 7XX fields is dependent on the sophistication of a MARC system's design;
- Behavior of catalog users must be taken into account;
- **Retraining of catalog users may be needed.**



#### USE OF 7XX FIELD IN THE NORTH AMERICA

- 008 060417nb[]ac<u>a</u>nnaaan[][][][][][][][][][]ua[]ana[][][][][]
- 010 [][]\$an 2006269255
- 040 [][]\$aDLC\$beng\$cDLC\$dHkCAN [subfield \$f not needed]
- 110 2[]\$aBeijing da xue.\$bTu shu guan
- 410 2[]\$a北京大学.\$b图书馆
- 410 2[]\$αΠανεπιστήμιο Πεκίνου.\$bΒιβλιοθήκη
- 410 2[]\$aPeking University.\$bLibrary
- 710 27\$a北京大学.\$b图书馆\$0(HkCAN)0012345 \$2hkcan

Note: 008/11 (Subject heading system/thesaurus) = "a" (LCSH)



# **USE OF 7XX FIELD IN CHINA**

- 008 060417nb[]ac<u>z</u>nnaaan[][][][][][][][][][]ua[]ana[][][][][]
- 035 [][]\$a(HkCAN)012345
- 040 [[[]\$aDLC\$bchi\$cDLC\$dHkCAN\$fhkcan [thesaurus code]
- 110 2[]\$a北京大学.\$b图书馆
- 410 2[]\$aBeijing da xue.\$bTu shu guan
- 410 2[]\$αΠανεπιστήμιο Πεκίνου.\$bΒιβλιοθήκη
- 410 2[]\$aPeking University.\$bLibrary
- 710 20\$aBeijing da xue.\$bTu shu guan\$0(DLC)n[][]2006269255

Note: 008/11 (Subject heading system/thesaurus) = "z" (Other); thesaurus identified in 040\$f

